

School of Theology at Claremont



10017008564



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY
IN THE XIXTH CENTURY

THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY IN THE XIXTH CENTURY

BY DR FREDRIK NIELSEN

BISHOP OF AALBORG, AND FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL
HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

TRANSLATED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
ARTHUR JAMES MASON, D.D.

MASTER OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

VOL. II

LEO XII. TO PIUS IX

BX
1386
N5
1906
V.2

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1906

University of Southern California

Rel. 282 N 669²
V. 2

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
XIV. LEO XII.	I
XV. PIUS VIII.—A PAPACY OF TWENTY MONTHS . . .	31
XVI. GREGORY XVI.	51
XVII. FIRST YEARS OF PIUS IX.	102
XVIII. VICTORIES AND DEFEATS	166
XIX. THE SEPTEMBER CONVENTION AND THE ENCYCLICAL OF 8TH DECEMBER 1864	239
XX. THE VATICAN COUNCIL	290
XXI. THE FALL OF ROME	375
INDEX	467

228227

THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY

CHAPTER XIV

LEO XII

ON 2nd September 1823, thirty-seven of the Roman cardinals walked from the church of San Silvestro to the Quirinal,¹ which on account of the time of year had been prepared for the Conclave. In the long procession the first to be seen was Consalvi, bowed down by sorrow and sickness.² He had but little prospect of being elected, because a man cannot be twice Pope in a lifetime. The cardinals were afraid of the all-powerful Secretary of State, and the people sang a malicious verse about the Conclave: "Heaven free us from a despot like Consalvi."³ After him followed Pacca with firm steps and a mild countenance, and by his side walked the old Di Gregorio. Behind came Galeffi, who did not look at all intelligent, but had become the favourite of the people by his condescension. "It would be wise," so runs the song, "to elect the good Galeffi."⁴ In the procession there was also a tall lean man with tottering steps and pale cheeks; "it looked," says Cardinal Wiseman, "as if he had just risen from a sick-bed to lay himself down upon his death-bed." The man was Della Genga; of him the song says: "He who wishes for order in everything, must pray that Della Genga may be chosen."

Austria had charged Cardinal Albani, formerly nuncio at

¹ Coppi: *Annali* V, 322.

² Cp. Wiseman, 213.

³ Artaud: *Histoire du Pape Léon XII.* (Paris 1843) I, 33.

⁴ Even in 1829 Gioacchino Pecci (afterwards Leo XIII.) told his brother, that the Romans bowed lower to Galeffi than to the Pope himself, and that he would be chosen Pope, if the people had to choose.—*Revue de Paris*, 15th April 1895, 676.

Vienna,¹ with the representation of the interests of the empire in the Conclave. In his instructions Metternich bade Count Apponyi, the Austrian ambassador at Rome, to speak warmly about Pius VII. in the speech he had to deliver to the assembled cardinals before the opening of the Conclave; for Austria admired the lively faith and the unflinching courage which Pius had disclosed under adversity and persecution. Metternich also suggested that the Count should let fall a few words in praise of the "Conservative principle," which alone was able to prevent the recurrence of times of sorrow and disaster, and alone could preserve Europe from new "shocks." The Austrian Emperor did not wish any special cardinal to be elected; he only wished that the tiara might fall to a capable man, who with enlightened piety combined a conciliatory character and moderate principles. Any cardinal who did not possess these qualities was to be kept away from St Peter's chair. Metternich did not conceal from Count Apponyi that such a task had its difficulties, because a conclave sets both pride and selfishness in great activity. But Cardinal Albani must only as a last resource use the veto, which had scarcely ever done any good; and if it became necessary to use it, it must immediately be reported to Vienna. Metternich entertained the hope that "the indirect veto," the support of the good candidates, would have more effect; and it could not wound the cardinals' sense of freedom.²

The Austrian Chancellor had expressed the same view in despatches to the Courts of Naples, Sardinia, and France,³ and everything seemed to point to a mutual understanding between the principal Catholic powers at the impending Conclave. But the concord was only on the surface. The Sardinian government made known to its minister at Rome that people in Turin did not wish to see an Austrian subject elected, and that it was important to Sardinia that Austria should not acquire a still greater influence in Italy. The

¹ See concerning him Reumont: *Beiträge zur italienischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart 1857) V, 342f.

² Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* II, 2, 57. Despatch of 20th June 1823, two months before the death of Pius VII., to Count Apponyi.

³ Bianchi II, 181f.

same considerations guided the policy of France at the Conclave. Chateaubriand told the Court of Turin that France desired a pope who would watch affairs in Italy with the greatest interest, "and would take care that the influence of a foreign power in Italy, already too great, did not become greater."¹ Close friendship and the ties of blood made the King of Naples join with "his dear son-in-law," the Emperor of Austria, but only as far as it involved no danger of injury to the interests of Naples.²

At nine in the evening of 2nd September, after the foreign ambassadors had paid their visits to the cardinals, the door of the Conclave was shut; and, in order to hasten the election, it was decided that the cardinals during their seclusion were not to have access to the garden of the Quirinal. In the Conclave of 1823, which finally consisted of forty-nine members, there were the same differences of opinion as in the conclaves which immediately preceded it. There was a party of *Zelanti* who desired a pope "whose policy was as strict as his dogma"; if this policy were to win, a more ecclesiastical feeling would pervade the government. The candidate of the party was Severoli, Bishop of Viterbo. Della Genga was also a member of that group, but he had displeased one of the leaders of the *Zelanti* outside the Conclave, the papal treasurer, Cristaldi, and therefore the prospect of his election seemed at first very remote. The other party, the *Moderati*, followed the lead of the Catholic powers, and wished, like Austria, for a gentle pope, who would accommodate himself to circumstances. The moderate cardinals thought of electing Castiglioni, Bishop of Frascati, afterwards Pius VIII. A small band joined them, who had gathered round Consalvi, and who wished either for him in person or for one who would walk in his steps.

At the first voting Severoli had eight votes, Castiglioni five, Pacca two, and Consalvi one; the remaining votes were divided amongst various candidates. But Severoli obtained more day by day; on the 17th in the morning he had twenty, Della Somaglia sixteen, Castiglioni nine, and Della Genga

¹ Bianchi II, 183.

² The instruction of King Ferdinand to Cardinal Ruffo, of 29th August 1823, is printed in Bianchi II, 379f.; cp. Cipolletta: *Memorie politiche sui conclavi*, 141f.

four. The Marchese Fuscaldo, the Ambassador of Naples to Rome, then wrote to the Neapolitan foreign secretary: "Severoli makes *me* afraid. The Austrian ambassador does not seem to fear."¹ In his anxiety Fuscaldo turned to Count Apponyi, but the Austrian ambassador reassured him by saying that Cardinal Albani was sure to follow his instructions, and he did not mean to interfere. On the 19th, however, Albani also began to be afraid, and in the evening he went to the cell of the French cardinal, De la Fare, to hold a private meeting with him and the other French cardinal, Clermont-Tonnerre, Archbishop of Toulouse; Ruffo also and two other cardinals came there.² It seems that they agreed to make use of "the indirect veto," as Metternich had recommended. But the attempt failed, and the next morning Severoli obtained twenty-seven votes. As this was a sign that he would probably be elected at the next voting, there remained nothing else for Cardinal Albani to do but to use the solemn veto, and he therefore told the cardinals that it was his unpleasant duty to declare that the Imperial Court of Vienna could not accept (*non può accettare*) his Eminence, Cardinal Severoli, as Pope.³

Severoli took his exclusion calmly, but his party was furious, and some of the *Zelanti* hinted that Albani had overstepped his authority. In order to put an end to this talk, Count Apponyi sent the Conclave a memorandum, in which he declared that Cardinal Albani had acted closely in accordance with his instructions.⁴ This declaration created a still greater bitterness amongst the cardinals, and the Austrian candidate, Castiglioni, had to suffer for it. On the morning of the 21st he had obtained eighteen votes, but in the evening he only obtained ten—perhaps also, because it was suspected that Consalvi had voted for him in the hope of keeping the secretaryship if Castiglioni were elected.

Under these circumstances, it became imperative for the *Zelanti* to concentrate their votes round another of the party as soon as possible, and the choice fell on Della Genga.

¹ Despatch in Bianchi II, 382f.

² Bianchi II, 187f.

³ The veto in Bianchi II, 188. Cp. Della Gattina IV, 342f.

⁴ Bianchi II, 188.

But Della Genga's *aura* had scarcely begun to rise before it was reported that France would use her right of veto against him. The apparent harmony between France and Austria was at an end, and the Neapolitans in the Conclave did not know what to do. Cardinal Ruffo complained bitterly to the Marchese Fuscaldò; but before he received an answer the two French cardinals unexpectedly caused the scales to sink in favour of Della Genga, and on the morning of the 28th he was elected by thirty-four votes. The cardinals had succeeded in spite of the Catholic governments in carrying the election of a *Zelante*; but unanimity was not obtained at the last moment.

Annibale Francesco Clemente Melchior Girolamo della Genga,¹ was born in the castle of La Genga, near Spoleto, on 22nd August 1760. Leo XI., the successful rival of Cardinal Baronius for the tiara, had during his papacy of twenty-six days elevated one of the forefathers of Annibale della Genga, a painter, to the nobility, and since then the family had boasted of a castle and a coat of arms. It was in acknowledgment of this favour that Cardinal della Genga, when he was elected Pope, assumed the name of Leo XII.

The future Pope, who had nine brothers and sisters, after passing through different schools had entered the ecclesiastical academy in Rome, and became a special favourite of Pius VI. In 1783 he was ordained priest, and shortly afterwards he obtained an office at the papal Court. When Joseph II. died, he was entrusted with the task of preaching the memorial sermon on the late Emperor in the Sistine chapel in the presence of the Pope and cardinals, and he fulfilled that duty with tact; many, it was said, formed a presentiment that he would be "a faithful friend of kings." In the period that followed, Della Genga rose higher on the ecclesiastical ladder; he was always about Pius VI., and spoke freely to him. One day the young Della Genga was wearing a very long cloak. "Your cloak is too long," said the Pope. "It does not matter," answered the young man boldly; "Your Holiness may make it shorter whenever you please." A shorter cloak was the sign of the next step on the ecclesiastical ladder.

In the course of a few years, Della Genga became a prelate,

¹ Artaud: *Histoire du Pape Léon XII.* I, 3f.

Archbishop of Tyre, and nuncio at Lucerne. Thence he was sent in the same capacity to Cologne as Pacca's successor, but on account of the war he could not take up his abode there; he stayed at Dresden and at Augsburg. As nuncio he was not famous for the self-restraint which afterwards distinguished him as Pope, and the character he left in Germany was by no means good; "he passes here," Khevenmüller wrote of him to Vienna in 1804, "for a talented man, but of no strict morals,¹ and all in disorder with his money matters."² In the year 1805 Pius VII. appointed him nuncio extraordinary at the diet of Regensburg, but Napoleon wished to have Bernier, whom we know from the history of the Concordat, in his stead. Pius VII., however, would not give in to the Emperor in this matter, and Della Genga went to Regensburg. Afterwards he stayed at Munich and at Paris, and, on his way from the latter town to Italy, he witnessed the violence of Napoleon towards the Pope. As soon as he returned to Italy he took up his abode at the Abbey of Monticelli. There he passed the time in teaching the peasants to sing Gregorians, and to play the organ, and in shooting birds, a pastime which he continued as Pope, when he went into the gardens of the Vatican, to the scandal of the cardinals.³ His health was much broken down; he had already erected his tomb, and was prepared to die forgotten and unheeded.

But when Pius VII. returned, he was brought out of his hiding-place and sent to Paris to congratulate Louis XVIII. Consalvi was also at that time in the French capital as the representative of the Pope, and he did not approve of another person being sent to Paris on such an errand. A violent scene ensued between the two papal envoys, during which Consalvi used such bitter words, that his secretary, Capaccini, burst into tears. Della Genga kept silence for the moment, but he complained to Louis XVIII., who comforted him as well as he could. He considered it advisable, however, to retire to Monticelli, and live there in quiet so long as his

¹ "As nuncio in Germany and France, Della Genga was reputed the father of a number of illegitimate children." Nippold II, 75.

² *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, 1892, 37.

³ Brosch II, 314.

enemy governed the Papal States; but Pius VII. would not leave him in peace. In 1816 Della Genga was appointed Cardinal, and afterwards he received the see of Sinigaglia. But he never went into residence there, as he was shortly afterwards appointed Cardinal-Vicar; and as such he was bound to live in Rome.

Such was the past of the man who ascended St Peter's throne in difficult times. When he had been elected and they asked him as usual: "Do you accept the election?" he answered: "No; let be! You are choosing a dead man!"¹ Bodily weakness, however, has never been a hindrance, but sometimes a great recommendation, for the man who is to govern the Roman Church. That Della Genga seemed to be on the path from the sick-bed to the grave was one of the circumstances, which had made his election possible.² Immediately after his appointment they wished to force upon him a sort of Council of Cardinals, in the hope that they would govern in his name; but he was both bodily and mentally strong enough to resist such a tutelage; he would not acknowledge these enforced advisers as a Council of State, and would not promise to call them together at fixed times.³

During the Conclave an anonymous treatise was circulated in the Papal States, the printing place of which was not stated. Its title was: "Considerations upon Pius VII.'s *Motu proprio* of 1816," and it created a great stir.⁴ The author started with the supposition that there was a party of influential people, who wished to set aside the new arrangements and to restore everything to the old order. The treatise contained a defence of the *Motu proprio*, and showed that it had been, and was, a necessity. It was accordingly a defence of the home policy of Consalvi. Shortly afterwards two other treatises were published, which took an opposite view. The one was that which we have already mentioned⁵ by the Dominican Anfossi.⁶ He maintained in it, that those who had received any portion of the Church's possessions could not be saved, unless they

¹ Artaud I, 76.

² Cp. the despatch to Chateaubriand, Artaud I, 130.

³ Artaud I, 131.

⁴ J. G. Köberle I, 74f.

⁵ Vol. I, p. 350.

⁶ A translation of an extract from Anfossi's treatise is found in H. E. G. Paulus: *Aufkl. Beiträge zur Dogmen-, Kirchen-, und Religionsgeschichte* (Bremen 1830) I, 183f.

restored to the Church her old property, or obtained the Pope's leave to do otherwise. The other was by the learned archæologist and advocate Fea, and in it he defended the supremacy of the Pope over princes even in temporal matters.¹ Consalvi had prohibited the publication of both these treatises, but now they appeared with the highest approval and to the great joy of the leading cardinals, to whom the election of Leo XII. was above everything else a protest against the rule of the former secretary.

Della Somaglia, a man eighty years of age, not energetic and quite ignorant of politics, was appointed Papal Secretary;² but he was too much enfeebled by age to strike out a new line, and it was not long before the Pope himself fell into a long illness, which put a stop to everything. The hæmorrhoidal trouble which Leo XII. had had for several years grew worse and worse, and he became weaker day by day from the loss of blood. Under such circumstances it seemed right to think of a new conclave, and the diplomatists again became busy. Austria and France again laid their plans in order to get a *Moderato* elected; Spain, on the contrary, wanted a *Zelante*. The College of Cardinals held secret meetings, and the inhabitants of Rome expected every day to hear the bell of the Capitol ring.

Leo XII., however, recovered, and as soon as he was tolerably well, he expressed a wish to see Consalvi, who had retired from all business, and thought of nothing but the erection of a monument to the late Pope. Consalvi lived at Porto d'Anzo in order to be in purer air, and to escape disturbing and tiring visits; and it was his wish to end his active life in quiet retirement. But as soon as he heard that the Pope wished to speak to him he left Porto d'Anzo immediately and went to Rome, and for the first time, after the lapse of a long period, the two old opponents had

¹ The treatise of Fea is translated in Paulus: *Sophronizon* VII, 6, ff.

² In some character sketches, made by the French police, of the cardinals who were at Paris in 1810, Della Somaglia is thus described: "Il s'est fait dévôt à toute outrance depuis qu'il est évêque; il ne manque ni d'esprit, ni d'instruction; mais il est imbu de tous les préjugés de la Cour de Rome. Il entend raison dans le tête-à-tête, et il désapprouve tout ce qui se fait à Rome depuis quelques années, parce qu'il n'a été consulté sur rien. C'est un homme minutieux et vain. En le flattant et en caressant son orgueil on peut le gagner aisément." Geoffroy de Grandmaison: *Napoléon et les cardinaux noirs* (Paris 1895), 236.

a friendly conversation. Consalvi was so weak, that he had to be carried into Leo's room; but he had mental power enough to express his thoughts with animation and clearness. It was a political testament which after mature deliberations he pounded to the new Pope.¹ He began with some expressions of a general nature. "As your Holiness knows, no art is so difficult as that of governing a State. I have only learnt it after many mistakes; but from them one can gather wisdom. The greatest mistake is to write too much. I have followed the rule which obtained formerly in the Secretary of State's office, to write little and to write well. When we answer too much, misfortunes easily result. We then often become not the sole possessors of an important secret; we may easily come to lying, and lies are a bottomless sea. Many courts live as a rule amid lies; but a single lie would be enough to make a Roman government impossible. A new Pope would be required on the spot."

Thereupon Consalvi proceeded to mention particular points of foreign policy. "Your Holiness," he said, "will find it difficult to make Louis XVIII. forget the journey of Pius VII. to Paris; but the King's brother has not heard anything of this journey, or else he has forgotten about it. His friendship should be cultivated without offending Louis XVIII. for your Holiness and the King need one another. The French kings are masters of the Levant, where so many Catholics live under such fearful oppression. Hospitality cannot be refused to the Bonaparte family, but it must be shown with moderation. The Bonapartes, like all conquered people, are always in opposition; they join forces with the *Carbonari*; and on them it is necessary to keep a careful watch.² There are always sure to be injured or incapable persons who will reveal your secrets for you.

"We could not celebrate the jubilee year under Pius VII., but now the time for it is approaching. It ought to be announced in 1824, and kept in 1825. You will meet with difficulties of

¹ Artaud I, 166f. Artaud was the first to obtain the gist of the conversation from the Duke of Laval, to whom Consalvi had spoken of it. Afterwards he had Consalvi's reports supplemented partly by the Duchess of Devonshire, partly from the Pope's own mouth.

² Consalvi had in this respect been himself on his guard; cp. the two letters from the ex-King of Holland in Consalvi I, 146, 149.

all sorts. I have as good as promised to discourage it if my opinion were asked. You will encounter a thousand hindrances, but you must not give in. It is a trumpet that will call a hundred or even two hundred thousand witnesses to Rome to see a pope free in his capital, but do not repel those who in good faith call your attention to the dangers.

“What position ought we to take up towards the Catholics in South America? Last year I treated the Spanish Cortes with forbearance with a view to obtaining, in case they should remain in power for a lengthy period, the right of appointing bishops to the vacant sees in distant lands. The legitimate Spanish monarch has no authority over these provinces, each of which is like a kingdom. I have allowed Spain more than fifteen years in which to work for the establishment of her sovereignty, but whether it is due to ingratitude or to infirmity, Spain has used our silence as a weapon against the rebels. If Spain had granted us permission to appoint bishops in Columbia, Mexico, and wherever we demanded it, we would have granted the legitimate monarchy a respite of thirty years in which to get firmly into the saddle; but the time might easily come when Spain, without having regained her power, would say to us: ‘I must resign my sovereignty; save your dogmas as well as you can.’ It would then be too late for Rome. If we had waited so long, our apostolic vicar might have found the country filled with Methodists, Presbyterians, and new Sun-worshippers. I have therefore maintained friendly relations between Rome and those who so violently and with such a well-founded hope of success have refused obedience to the Juntas and to Ferdinand VII. I have also had my eye impatiently fixed on Paraguay. We ought to proceed there in a similar manner, but with a skill that will never be untrue to itself.

“With regard to Russia an ever-watchful attention is needed. Our Archbishop at Mohiloff is almost ninety years old and has no will of his own; but still he has will enough to be ambitious. He has for a long time, both by word of mouth and in writing, advanced ideas of a reunion between the Latin and the Greek Churches, but in a peculiar way. He wishes to be Patriarch in Russia, and your Holiness’s Legate. You will then have no further occasion to publish a single

decree of the Holy See. The Churches in Russia will be united *against* us, and there will not be a single true Roman voice from Galicia onwards. But Austria, which I have never found obstinate, will be ready enough to allow that country to remain faithful to us. All this is one of the results of the unjust partition of Poland; that country would have formed a barrier against the billows of schism that now threaten us. But soon you will have something to comfort you. In London I worked incessantly for the emancipation of the English Catholics. The Duchess of Devonshire has since helped me with different Cabinets and with King George. The matter proceeds slowly; but if you live you will see emancipation." After these political sayings Consalvi added: "You are stern; continue to be so. Pius VII. could not be so. But do not be afraid of showing yourself magnanimous, because you are born with a noble heart."

Finally, the conversation turned upon the Propaganda. Leo XII. was highly delighted with Consalvi's words, which had opened to him new views that he never had any idea of before, and he immediately appointed the great minister of his predecessor to be Prefect of the Propaganda. When the conversation was over, Leo XII. said to Cardinal Zurla: "What a conversation! I have never before had such a serious and important one with anybody, and one of such value for the State. . . . Pius VII. was fortunate in having such a great minister; that good fortune cannot fall to my lot. Cardinal della Somaglia has waited forty years to be Secretary of State; he must keep that place. But Consalvi and I will often work together, if only we do not both die to-day."¹

Leo had reason to express this fear. The statesman in Consalvi had revived for a while, and he had forgotten much, in order to live in the present, and to take thought for the future. But it caused his illness to become worse, and he was near to death. Cardinal Castiglioni carried the papal blessing from the sick-bed of Leo XII. to the death-bed of Consalvi, and after receiving it the great statesman breathed his last, on 24th January 1824, with the words: "I am at peace!" But Leo XII. lay ill for a long time. Consalvi's departure, and the disquieting news which he received of the

¹ Artaud I, 171f.

hopeless condition of a dear sister, told severely upon him. Still he recovered; and as soon as he was well enough, he attempted to carry out as much of Consalvi's political testament as his own abilities and the circumstances of the time allowed.

When the body of Pius VII. was exhibited, the catafalque was adorned with various pictures. One of these called to mind his restoration of the Society of Jesus. This act, which had at first met with dissatisfaction from more than one quarter, had by degrees won greater and greater approval. When Leo XII. came to the helm, there was already amongst the *Zelanti* a very strong Jesuit clique, and it grew in the course of years with the velocity of an avalanche. As a cardinal, Leo XII. had been opposed to the Jesuits; as Pope, he came into their power.

The inspiration of Jesuitism can be observed in the very first circular, of 5th May 1824, which Leo after the custom of the popes sent on ascending the throne to all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Roman Church. In this document he first of all impresses upon them to take care how they ordain to the priesthood; but he most admonishes them to pay heed to their dioceses, and to go about constantly amongst those who are entrusted to their care. In the trying times of the Roman Church, some bishops had gone to the courts of princes, others had been driven into solitude, and thereby ecclesiastical supervision had fallen into disuse in many places. The bishops needed therefore to be reminded that their proper place was neither in the palace nor in the cell. Leo XII. then condemns the school of thought "which professes tolerance or indifference, not only in civil, but also in religious, questions; and which teaches that God has given man absolute freedom, so that he may without any danger to his salvation join the sect that pleases him most"—a condemnation that in its consequences, and interpreted according to Roman Catholic principles, became a condemnation of liberty of conscience and religious freedom. In what follows the Bible Societies are once more condemned, because they may be said "rather to corrupt than to translate the Holy Scriptures."¹

To remove any doubt as to where the Pope had

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XVI, 45f.

sought his counsellors, the *Collegium Romanum* was some days afterwards restored to the Jesuits,¹ in order that these "distinguished men, who shine by saintly morals, by great qualities, and by scholarship," may now, as in former times, employ all their strength in the education of the young. The Jesuits obtained, in the period that followed, more and more property and privileges,² and it is their voice that we hear through many of Leo's pronouncements, as for instance in the brief that was sent on 2nd July 1826 to the schismatics in France, who had not yet acquiesced in the Concordat of 1801 and its consequences for the episcopate. In this it is stated with an appeal to St Augustine that every one who has been separated from the Catholic Church, however praiseworthy he may imagine his own career to be, "has not life"; for the crime of being separated from the unity of Christ, if for nothing else, "the wrath of God abideth on him."³

The sternness Consalvi had counselled appeared in many ways.⁴ It is felt behind the above-mentioned admonitions to the bishops, and in the publication of a command to keep the fasts in earnest. Leo XII. himself took the lead with regard to abstinence and economy; his table cost him only one *scudo* a day; and like Sixtus V., he strove with all his might to amass treasure in St Angelo. A new code was published, by which cheaper judicial proceedings were granted. The educational system was also revised, and the universities especially underwent a thorough change. The Bull of Leo XII. *Quod divina sapientia*, of 24th August 1824, established the rules for the inner life and discipline of the universities and secondary schools, which remained in force until the downfall of the Papal States. New professorships were founded, and admission to educational posts was made free except to certain theological professorships; but Latin became the language both of the law courts and of the schools.⁵ The parishes in Rome were reorganised in order to make the incomes of the different priests more equal, and the rebuilding of St Paul's church after the fire was

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XVI, 52f. ; cp. 444f.

² *Bullarium Romanum* XVI, 448f.

³ *Ibid.*, 444.

⁴ Wiseman, 245f.

⁵ Farini I, 18, who calls it "a torture" (*lo strazio della lingua latina*).

commenced. By his economy Leo XII. not only obtained the funds for this costly building, but he also took care that embankments were made to protect the country round Tivoli against the inundations of the river Anio, and this was done although, on his succession, he had immediately reduced the taxes.¹

Leo spent his time from morning till night at his writing-desk, except when he suddenly appeared in hospitals or other institutions to see if his orders were being punctually executed. He became year by year more mistrustful, and he would not allow others to do anything; he liked to interfere in everything both great and small.² The illumination of St Peter's in Holy Week was prohibited, and a Swiss was placed in every church to command strangers to be silent, and to keep unsuitably clad persons outside. He thereby offended the travellers who visited Rome, and he aroused the enmity of his own subjects by another measure. He forbade the landlords of the taverns to allow their customers to be seated. In front of the tavern doors a lattice was erected, through which the wine could be handed out, but no one was allowed to enter. By this means Leo wished not only to put a check upon excess, but also to make an end of the unhappy brawls, which were the order of the day in the Roman taverns. This regulation was especially disliked and it was done away with immediately after his death.

Greater sympathy was awakened amongst the Romans by his decision to gather Christendom to the city of St Peter in 1825, in order to partake of the treasures of indulgences and graces which are distributed in a year of Jubilee.

In Leviticus xxv. it is commanded, that when seven times seven years have passed, the trumpet shall sound on the tenth day in the seventh month in the forty-ninth year, as a sign that the coming year shall be a year of jubilee, in which the land shall rest, and the poor shall have the property of his fathers restored. The year of the trumpet or jubilee was to be a year of grace, a restoration of everything that had been ravaged in the intervening time by the sins

¹ Nippold: *Bunsen* I, 215; cp. also Gavazzi's explanation of this on p. 125 of the work referred to.

² He thus offended Pacca, who resigned his post as Camerlengo.—Köberle I, 185.

of men, an abolition of the thralldom of sin, a raising up of the children of God to true liberty, and a freeing of creation from the bondage of corruption, under which, for the sake of mankind, it is groaning.

This Old Testament idea of a golden year of grace was taken up by the Papacy. It was Boniface VIII. who, in the year 1300, first summoned Christendom to Rome to a jubilee year, and according to his intention it was to be a festival which only recurred once in every century. The number one hundred had already been hallowed by the ancients. "Plato would have it that souls purified themselves every century; giants had a hundred hands, and the greatest sacrifices (hecatombs) consisted of a hundred victims." Boniface VIII. called the old men of Rome together, and when their memory had been aided a little, they related that they had heard from their fathers that a full indulgence had been granted on the first day of the year 1200. So Boniface ordered the year of jubilee, and many thousands poured into Rome—so many that precautions had to be taken to prevent disaster on account of the throngs.¹ But even in 1342 Clement VI. had already reduced the interval between the jubilee years to half a century in order that so many should not die without seeing such a year of grace. Urban VI. declared that every century was to have three years of jubilee, one for every thirty-three years, the period of our Saviour's lifetime. Sixtus IV. celebrated the jubilee in 1475, and since that time there have been four in every century. Following this rule, Pius VI. celebrated it in 1775.

What then does a year of jubilee mean according to the Roman Catholic view? A cardinal of the Roman Church gives the following explanation: "It is a year in which the Holy See does all it can to make Rome spiritually attractive, and spiritually only. The theatres are closed, public amusements suspended, even private recreation pressed within the bounds of Lenten regulations. But all that can help a sinner to amendment, or assist the devout to feed his faith, and nourish his piety, is freely and lavishly ministered. The pulpit is occupied by the most eloquent preachers awakening the conscience or instructing ignorance. The confessionals

¹ Cp. Dante: *Inferno* XVIII, 28f.

are held in constant possession by priests who speak every language. Pious associations or confraternities receive, entertain, and conduct from sanctuary to sanctuary the successive trains of pilgrims. The altars are crowded by fervent communicants; while, above all, the spiritual remission of temporal punishment for sin, known familiarly to Catholics under the name of an Indulgence, is more copiously imparted, on conditions by no means over easy."¹

So far the Cardinal. We will now hear what Garibaldi's camp chaplain, the former Benedictine monk, Gavazzi, thinks of the significance of the year of jubilee. The first conclusion at which we must arrive is, that the jubilee year is not kept for the sake of the salvation of souls. This was only a pretext, not the real reason. But whatever the reason may have been, Boniface chose a very fortunate period. The crusades, which had brought armed pilgrims to the grave of Christ, had ceased; instead of these, unarmed bodies of pilgrims now came to the heart of Europe. The pilgrimages to the church in Jerusalem, which the Greeks had been so eager to arrange, had taught the Pope two things: the authority which the Church might gain thereby, and the credulity of the people about a religious deception. Let them but be dazzled by splendid ceremonies. Finally, the pilgrimages to Mecca have shown the Pope what importance such pilgrimages may have.² The true motive was, according to Gavazzi, *auri sacra fames*, thirst for gold. Cardinal Wiseman has told us what the year of jubilee might be for many simple-minded pilgrims to Rome, but Gavazzi has expressed the motive that has guided several of the popes who have summoned Christendom to Rome. To very many of these, the wish to throw splendour over the Papacy, and not regard for the salvation of souls, has been the decisive reason. Consalvi's counsel shows that this motive was not absent from the Papacy in 1824.³

On Ascension Day, 27th May 1824, Leo XII. promulgated

¹ Wiseman, 272.

² *My Recollections*, 149.

³ It is not probable, however, that the desire for money played a great part on this occasion. Artaud (I, 366) says expressly of the papal treasurer, that he was "partagé entre ses sentiments religieux et l'austérité de ses principes financiers, qui craignoient les dépenses, que devoit supporter l'état."

his Bull.¹ He says in it that he has decided, according to the authority which is given him, to open every means of access to the heavenly treasure which has been collected by the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, His Mother, and all the saints. "May the earth hear the words of My mouth, and the whole world joyfully listen to the sound of the high priest's trumpet, that announces the holy year of jubilee to the people of God." Consalvi had shown true foresight when he predicted that it would meet with hindrances from many quarters. Naples made all sorts of difficulties, and the Neapolitan ambassador was even ordered to attempt to form a diplomatic league in order to hinder the execution of the Pope's project. Austria was cool, and the Protestant powers in Germany were not pleased with the year of jubilee. But Leo XII. stuck firmly to his purpose.

The year of jubilee was prepared for by a series of sermons, whose aim was to rouse sinners from their sleep.² Eloquent preachers stood in churches and in public places, preaching conversion and repentance. On the Piazza Navona, Muccioli gathered 15,000 people to his preaching of repentance, and the Pope concluded these services with his blessing; to the great scandal of his subjects, in order to hear the sermon, he had taken his seat in the palace of the Russian Minister, who was a schismatic. The churches and chapels of Rome were repaired, and room was provided for the many pilgrims who were expected. An order was issued which forbade the priests to wear round hats, many-coloured and short garments, and "secular" neckcloths; and the women were ordered to appear in modest attire to make the Eternal City a holy city in the year of jubilee. The theatre was closed, and all worldly amusements were stopped.³

On 24th December 1824 the year of grace began.⁴ On that day the cardinals and prelates gathered in one of the halls of the Vatican, and from thence the procession was formed towards the Sistine Chapel; Leo XII. walked first

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XV, 55f.

² Wiseman, 276.

³ Gams II, 441.

⁴ Cp. for the following Artaud I, 416f. The author was himself an eye-witness, and what he did not himself see he has related on the authority of *L'ami de la religion et du roi*.

in full attire with his mitre upon his head. The Sacrament was exhibited in the chapel, and candles were there distributed to the cardinals, the prelates, and the magistrates. The Pope received a gilded candle, and with it in his hand he began the *Veni Creator*, which was then taken up by the whole choir. During the singing, Leo XII. took his place in his portable chair, and, with a canopy over him, was carried to the church of St Peter. When he had proceeded thus far, he descended from his chair and took his seat on a throne which had been erected for him. After a short rest, he walked from the throne to one of the doors of St Peter's which was walled up. One of the cardinals handed him a silver hammer, and with it he struck the walled-up door thrice, chanting, "Open me the gates of righteousness." The choir answered: "When I have entered in by them I will confess the Lord." The Pope continued: "I will go into Thine house, O Lord!" and thereupon the choir answered: "In the holy temple, I will worship in Thy fear." Finally, the Pope cried with a loud voice: "Open the gates, for God is with us!" and the choir added: "He who created virtue in Israel." Then Leo returned the hammer to the cardinal, and again took his seat upon his throne, after giving a sign, upon which the brickwork that filled the door was broken down. The fragments were removed with great speed, and when *Te Deum* had been sung, the Pope walked bare-headed, with the cross in one hand, and a lighted candle in the other, through the now open door into the church, followed by cardinals and prelates, while the Swiss guard on the Piazza of St Peter's and the artillery at St Angelo fired a salute to inaugurate the year of jubilee. After a procession round the inside of the church, Leo XII. went to the high altar and said the first Mass of Christmas, and when it was ended, he blessed the great crowd that streamed in through the doors of the church, which now were opened. At the same time Della Somaglia, Pacca, and a third cardinal had opened "doors of grace" in the three other principal churches of Rome with similar solemnities, and all the church bells of Rome rang for three consecutive hours. On Christmas Eve, according to ancient custom, Leo XII. consecrated a hat and a sword to be bestowed upon a prince or general who had

deserved well of the Church; and the Duke of Angoulême was the happy recipient of these consecrated objects, because he had been the leader in suppressing the Spanish Revolution under the auspices of the Holy Alliance.¹

The year of jubilee drew not a few pilgrims to Rome; ² fewer, however, than were expected. On the day after the door of grace was opened, there was found beside it a sketch of a large bottle or *fiasco*. That was the criticism passed by the popular wit of Rome.³ Before Easter the concourse of people was very small; ⁴ but it increased between Easter and Whitsuntide. Most of the pilgrims were from the neighbouring countries. Naples alone sent 44,973. The more remote countries and the Protestant States sent but few, Sweden thirty, Denmark eight; and from Catholic Austria there came only twenty. The Emperor was himself travelling in the north of Italy, but on account of "political circumstances," he kept aloof; the power of Josephinism was not yet broken in Austria. On the other hand, the Infante of Spain, King Francis I. of the Two Sicilies, and the Dowager Queen of Sardinia, visited Rome, and the last-named received in reward for her piety the consecrated Rose. The propaganda was carried on with energy, and it was reckoned that fifty proselytes were won over in the year of jubilee, partly Protestants, partly Roman Jews.⁵ Large collections were made amongst the faithful, and the money that came in was used for missions amongst the heathen.

But under the godly surface much ungodliness and unbelief were hidden. A Frenchman distributed vulgar pictures,⁶ and "white pilgrims" of the worst sort came to Rome.⁷ Atheism had taken deep root amongst the young scholars. On the day when the students of the Roman University walked round the city, in procession from church to church, a frivolous spirit was manifest amongst the young people, which ill harmonised with the solemnity. As a punishment neither prizes nor doctor's degrees were given that year in the University. Outside Rome

¹ In former times Don John of Austria, John Sobiesky, Prince Eugène and Field Marshal Daun amongst others had received this distinction.

² Coppi V, 362: "Circa quattrocento mila pellegrini"; Gams II, 454, says only "etwa 90,000."

³ Cp. Bunsen I, 245.

⁴ Fr. Nippold: *Richard Rothe* (Wittenberg 1873) I, 387.

⁵ Köberle I, 195.

⁶ Artaud I, 369.

⁷ Coppi V, 378.

the disaffection was still worse. At Forlì lampoons were distributed during the missionary sermons, and the mob there besmirched the images of the saints. At Ferrara lewd ditties were sung during the processions, and at Bologna the students were guilty of serious excesses.¹ The Papal States in matters spiritual only half belonged to the Pope. And even among pious pilgrims there were some who afterwards became enemies of the Roman Church. Shortly before the year of Jubilee, the Pope and the cardinals had received the Abbé Lamennais with open arms. Leo XII. had his likeness in his bedroom, and he offered Lamennais one of the positions that is looked upon as a first step to the dignity of a cardinal. But the time was near when the fêted pilgrim was thrust away as a heretic.

Amusements of various kinds were also promised in order to draw pilgrims to Rome. Thus, in the month of June 1825, great festivities were held on the occasion of the coronation of Charles X. at Reims. At the Villa Medici the French ambassador, the Duke of Laval, gave a splendid fête; Champollion had constructed for it an obelisk in the Egyptian style, upon which Charles X. was glorified in hieroglyphics.² A coronation festival did not profane the solemn stillness of the year of jubilee; a coronation was a half ecclesiastical function, for the throne, as all men knew, rested on the altar. But there were also festivities of a more ecclesiastical character. The brotherhood of the *Sacconi* at Viterbo, dressed in white linen with covered heads, marched noiselessly and at a slow pace through the streets of Rome, with a skull and cross-bones carried in front of them.³ The inhabitants of Rome, and the strangers in the city, beheld with admiration these austere monks of rich and noble families, who never speak as long as they wear the dress of their order, and who both flog themselves and hear a sermon before they take any food. It was somewhat at variance, however, with this great outward piety, that these stern *Sacconi* of Viterbo in the year of jubilee lodged with the *Stigmati* of Rome, and not with their Roman brethren of the same order, because they could not agree with them which group of *Sacconi* should head the procession. On

¹ Gams II, 450, 465, in accordance with the newspapers.

² Artaud II, 66, where there is to be found a picture of the obelisk.

³ Köberle I, 86.

the same day another procession of 5,000 women were seen going the round of the city, in order to obtain, according to the Pope's promise, the same advantages as might be gained by thirty visits to the churches. The women had taken no vow of silence, and a formidable chattering was heard wherever they passed. Behind all these processions stood the Jesuits, who more and more were getting power into their hands.

Beatifications were not wanting, either, in the year of jubilee.¹ As with canonisation, so with beatification the greatest caution is observed; the worthiness of the candidate is tested with a thoroughness that is sometimes overwhelming. The report of a process of canonisation may fill 4,000 pages, and the process itself cost over £9,000, while a process of beatification may run up to £4,000. In order to be counted amongst the blessed, however, something more than money is required, namely miracles (*prodigia*). It matters not whether these have been performed during the lifetime, or whether they have happened at the grave, of the person in question. When three such miracles have been proved, the party concerned is declared by the pope to be worthy of beatification, and the three miracles are painted and exhibited in St Peter's church, where a solemn service is then celebrated. The name of the blessed one is mentioned for the first time in the prayer *Oremus*, and while this is done the three pictures are unveiled. On Whitsun-Monday 1825, the Franciscan Observant Julian was placed amongst the blessed.² One of his miracles consisted in having made half-roasted birds fly from the spit.³ The Romans thought, however, that a saint who could make birds fly on to the spit would be more to the purpose.⁴ Afterwards, amongst others, the Jesuit coadjutor, Alfonso Rodriguez, was beatified,⁵ "at the petition of the whole Society of Jesus." Rodriguez, according to the documents relating to the process, is said to have received in 1599 a

¹ Köberle I, 95f.

² *Bullarium Romanum* XVI, 311f.

³ Under the picture was written: "Beatus Julianus aviculas, ut torrerentur ad ignem jam appositas, e veru extrahens nova vita donavit." R. Rothe relates how more than one on seeing this picture, said: "Questo è una burletta." Nippold: *R. Rothe* I, 405.

⁴ [H. Reuchlin]: *Bilder und Skizzen aus Rom* (Stuttgart 1844), 30f.

⁵ He was canonised in 1888.

revelation, after saying grace at table, to the effect that not only those Jesuits who then were sitting in the refectory, but also all Jesuits, then living, who remained in the society until their death, would be saved—a revelation that had its effect on some of those who were tempted to leave the order of Loyola.¹

When 24th December 1825 arrived the year of jubilee was at an end. On that day the cardinals and prelates were again gathered in the Vatican, and, led by the Pope, they walked with burning candles in their hands across the piazza of St Peter to the entrance of St Peter's church, where a splendid throne was again erected for Leo XII. The procession then passed through the church and out by the "door of grace." As soon as the procession was over, Leo XII. blessed the bricks and the lime, which were ready for the walling-up of the door, and he laid the first stones himself with prayer and supplication; some of the highest officials in the Papal States likewise added stones, and a carpet was then drawn across the door; the candles were put out, a *Te Deum* resounded over the great crowd, and a Bull, issued on Christmas Day, extended the year of jubilee to the whole of Catholic Christendom.²

On the sea-coast, and in the Campagna, many robbers and murderers roamed at large, and assaults were of daily occurrence.³ To put an end to this lawless state of things several cardinals were sent with extensive powers to the most harassed regions, and brigandage declined for a while. An aged priest, named Pellegrini, went like another St John alone into the mountains near Sezze and preached repentance and conversion to the hardened brigands who had found a safe hiding-place there. The simple words of the priest, and fear of the soldiers close by, touched their rough natures. When Pellegrini pledged his priestly word that their lives should be spared if they would surrender, they laid down their arms, and, like a lamb at the head of a pack of wolves, the Abate led the brigands to the town. They ended their lives in a mild confinement at Cività Vecchia.

As the *Carbonari* continued to win many followers in the

¹ Döllinger-Reusch : *Moralstreitigkeiten* I, 526. *Bullarium Romanum* XVI, 314f.

² *Bullarium Romanum* XVI, 373f. ; cp. 466f.

³ Farini I, 18.

Legations, Leo XII. as early as 1824 sent Cardinal Rivarola to Ravenna with the powers of a legate *a latere*. He surrounded himself with police and with spies, forbade people to go out after dark without a lantern, and dragged persons of all ages to prison. In order to give a death-blow to the *Carbonari* and to Freemasonry, Leo XII. issued on 13th March 1825 a Bull against secret societies, which repeated the condemnations pronounced against them from the days of Clement XII. to those of Pius VII., and added a new condemnation to them. Leo XII. gives it as his opinion that the secret societies have grown more dangerous since the days of Pius VII. He is especially anxious about the extension of their propaganda in the universities, where there are teachers "who think more of destroying than of educating their pupils," and who initiate them into their societies. What a difficult task it is to govern States! These secretaries scoff both at religion and at the authorities; they publish books in which they teach that Christianity is founded either upon scandals or upon stupidity, that God does not exist, and that there is no life after this.¹ The Pope wished through the *Carbonari* and the Freemasons to strike at the atheism which in the time of reaction drove more and more members into the secret societies. It was for the freethinkers what the time of the catacombs had been for Christianity, and not only Italy, but also the whole of Europe—mostly, however, in the Catholic countries—was undermined by atheism. Together with the atheists and the sceptics, the patriots also sought shelter in the catacombs. "A depraved youth" (*giovinastro per dutissimo*), son of Pius VII.'s cook, who wished to further the views of the *Carbonari* in Rome, enticed adherents to himself by describing a free and united Italy as the goal to be aimed at.²

Cardinal Rivarola had enough to do in sitting on the seat of judgment. On 31st August 1825 he pronounced sentence on more than 500 persons of all ages and of the most varied occupations.³ Some few were condemned to

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XVI, 345f.

² Coppi V, 358.

³ According to Farini (I, 20) thirty were noblemen, one hundred and fifty-six farmers and business men, two priests, seventy-four men of official position, thirty-eight military men, seventy-two doctors, engineers and literary men; the rest artisans.

death, many to imprisonment for a shorter or longer period, but most of them were placed under the supervision of the police. The strictest *precetto politico* bound the suspected persons to the places of their birth, and forbade them to leave the house before sunrise and after sunset. The party concerned was to report himself every other week to the police, to go to confession every month, and to engage in spiritual exercises in a monastery every year—a Catholic counterpart to the proceedings against Bruun in Denmark. Afterwards Rivarola became milder. He endeavoured to make peace by promoting marriages between the *Carbonari* and the *Sanfedisti*, and persons thus married received dowries from him; Faenza was especially the place for such political marriages between those whom the people themselves called cats and dogs. When mission preachers came to the Legations during the time of preparation for the year of jubilee, and in their preaching attacked the *Carbonari*, and called them heretics, the *Carbonari*, who did not hesitate to murder, attempted in various ways to remove Rivarola, but they were not successful.¹ A large sum was offered for the discovery of the murderers, and it was then found that there was a regular conspiracy against the life of Leo XII. The worst participators in the plot were punished; but the matter was hushed up, because not a few well-known families had members who were implicated in the guilt.²

Leo XII. showed great severity towards the Jews.³ A papal decree declared every transaction between Jews and Christians to be invalid, and the Jews were deprived of the right to own real property; what land they possessed was to be sold within a given time. The Jewish quarters (*ghetti*) were surrounded by walls and closed in with gates, and their inhabitants were forced to go to church. The Jews in Pesaro and Ferrara sent a deputation to Rome to ask for more humane laws, but Leo XII. would not receive it. The consequence was that a large number of the richer Jews emigrated to Lombardy, Venice, Trieste, and Tuscany.

The Pope exercised a strict supervision over his officials. In the College of Cardinals stormy scenes often took place

¹ Coppi V, 376.

² Köberle I, 255.

³ Köberle I, 195, and Farini I, 18.

in the presence of the Pope, because of the economies practised, and the abolition of many abuses. Leo XII. meanwhile declared that in future he would only give the cardinal's hat to men distinguished for piety and knowledge, and the dignity of cardinal was in future to be united with some important office; but the cardinals were not to receive more than their 4,000 scudi a year.¹ The Roman officials used to take long holidays at their pleasure in the hot season, but this was forbidden. When some of them acted in defiance of this order, they found, on returning from their holidays in 1826, that their posts were filled by others, "because it was supposed that their absence was a sign that they had given up their offices."² Many of the official class made their appointments lucrative in order to "provide for the family" (*bisogna far per la famiglia*) as they called it; but Leo was not slow in taking measures against such conduct. A *Congregazione di Vigilanza* was appointed which was to examine all complaints against officials, and Leo's system of espionage was thereby introduced into a new and fruitful field of action. But he was never successful in creating a really powerful government. "One half of us," so ran a Roman proverb, "commands, and the other half does not obey."³

Leo XII. put forward the monks on all occasions; but on the other hand he was very severe against them when they were guilty of any immorality. The island of Sardinia was in very bad repute in this respect, and when the Sardinian Court complained, the Pope sent Archbishop Ranaldi over to examine into the state of affairs. On Christmas Eve, the Sardinian monks sent the disagreeable inspector some sweetmeats, and after eating them Ranaldi died. Another cardinal suffered a similar fate in Sicily.⁴ Moreover, neither the monks nor the people were pleased when the Pope allowed none but the blind and the incurable to beg, and even these only at the doors of certain churches. Strangers, on the other hand, felt relieved at being free from the persecutions of the insistent Roman beggars.⁵ Still less in favour was another proclamation

¹ Köberle I, 204f.

■ *Ibid.*, 232.

³ Coppi V, 374, and Döllinger: *Kirche und Kirchen* (München 1861), 559.

⁴ Fr. Kölle: *Italiens Zukunft*, 133.

⁵ Artaud II, 285f.

which forbade the Roman housewives to dry clothes in the streets; it was a bad old custom, which it was very difficult to eradicate.¹ The Italians were also very angry at the severity of the Pope towards the theatres. The actors ran the risk of going to the galleys for five years if they said anything that was not in the prompter's book; and when the public applauded or hissed, an imprisonment might be in store for them varying from two to six months. For the theatre had become a place of political agitation and free thought, and it was in order to put an end to this in future that Leo watched the actors' words so closely. Science also sighed under a heavy yoke. An ignorant censor confounded Galvani with Calvin, and confiscated off-hand some of the writings of the great physicist.

Leo XII. had a firm faith in the moral strength of his subjects, and had serious thoughts of doing away with the army, and of using the sums that would thus be saved for the benefit of the country. He also hoped that it would be possible in time to raise the poorest section of the people to better conditions of life, so that they would give up brigandage and murder; but this hope was not realised. His government was not highly thought of, either by his contemporaries or by the age that immediately followed. A few years after his death in 1832, Leopold von Ranke wrote: "He was new to business and a thorough *doctrinaire*; and since he lacked proper equipment and a real knowledge of things, he made many mistakes. All that had been achieved under Consalvi was thrown away. Other popes have made themselves hated, but they have always had some adherents. Leo XII. was hated by all, and had no friends, neither amongst princes nor amongst beggars." Farini acknowledges that the Papal States owe Leo thanks for several good and useful acts; but, on the other hand, he blames him for unnecessary severity and for injustice.² And as for a real putting into execution of the *Motu proprio* of 1816, there was still less idea of it under Leo XII. than there had been under Pius VII.

In relation to foreign powers, on the other hand, Leo was very successful; the reactionary wind was favourable for the

¹ Köberle I, 212.

² Farini I, 24f.

course taken by St Peter's ship. The year in which Leo was elected was, as Bunsen immediately expressed it to his government, a victorious year for the legitimist principle.¹ The aged Della Somaglia, who was unacquainted with state affairs, was soon compelled to have recourse to Consalvi's secretary, Capaccini,² and this man obtained, in the period that followed, great influence in the foreign policy of the Papal States, until he received the cardinal's hat under Gregory XVI. It cost Leo XII. at first some effort to take counsel of a man who had witnessed the scene between him and Consalvi in Paris; but he was forced to do so, because Capaccini was indispensable. And he had every reason to be well pleased with the result of his diplomatic negotiations.

Louis XVIII. in France had been a sincere friend of the Church, and Charles X. was so in still greater degree. The Jesuits came again for a while into power in that country, but the nearer the month of July 1830 came, the greater grew the opposition to the order of Loyola, and the more Charles X. was obliged to give in to this opposition. When the former Spanish colonies in South America had gained their independence, they turned to the Pope and asked him to give them bishops; and they obtained them in 1827. At the wish of Pedro I. Rome entered into close connexion also with Brazil. In Paraguay, on the other hand, had arisen a desire to break with the Pope. Dr Francia allowed his subjects to be anything except atheists, and he wished to destroy the monkish spirit and to break with Rome without renouncing the Catholic faith. In Germany, the idea of a German National Church was abandoned, and its spokesman, the noble Wessenberg, had to leave his flock after the suppression of the bishopric of Constance.³ A new Concordat was made with Hanover by a Bull of circumscription,⁴ and in England the idea of Catholic emancipation gained more and more votes inside and outside Parliament. On account of Catholic Belgium, the Netherlands had also made a Con-

¹ Bunsen I, 512.

² Artaud I, 196f., and Bunsen I, 245f.

³ Nielsen: *Det indre Liv* I, 358f.

⁴ O. Mejer: *Zur Geschichte der röm.-deutschen Frage* III, 2, 233f.

cordat with Rome, similar to that of Napoleon ; but the Papacy did not succeed in bringing back to the Roman Church the little Old Catholic body of Jansenists, whose Archbishop resides at Utrecht. The Greek war of liberty, which was hailed with joy by many Romans of Consalvi's school,¹ did not produce an union between the Greek and Roman Churches as had been hoped. Captain Chiephala, who came to Rome to sell good Cyprus wine at a cheap price, and to open negotiations for reunion, was more successful with the former project than with the latter.

Leo XII. was not without anxious misgivings about the future. In 1826 he decreed nine days of penitence and prayer because "the spirit of fraudulence and of rebellion daily gained ground even among the educated classes."² It availed but little against this misfortune that the brethren of the Sacred Heart of Jesus celebrated a jubilee at which the future Pope, Pius IX., then Archbishop of Spoleto, delivered "a touching eulogy in honour of the Most Blessed Heart of Jesus."³ It was of greater use that the aged Della Somaglia resigned the post of Secretary of State in favour of Bernetti. The new secretary was an intelligent man, a friend of Rome's independence and of the power of the hierarchy, and well acquainted with the Roman manner of governing. He fought strongly against the Liberals as the enemies of throne and altar, but without being led entirely by Austria ; there was in him something of the anti-imperial spirit which had originally characterised the *Sanfedisti*. When Chateaubriand arrived in Rome as the French ambassador, he had an audience both of Leo and of his Secretary of State. He describes it thus : "Leo is tall of stature and he wears a calm, and at the same time, a sad expression ; he is dressed in a simple white cassock. There is no splendour in his house ; he lives in a poorly appointed chamber, which has scarcely any furniture. He eats next to nothing ; he lives with his cat⁴ on a little *polenta*. He knows that he is very ill and awaits death with a self-possession that is founded on Christian joy ; he might well like Benedict XIV.

¹ Artaud II, 111 ff., 321.

² Gams II, 466.

³ *Ibid.*, 475.

⁴ Chateaubriand inherited it after the death of the Pope.

place his coffin in his bed. . . . The Secretary of State, Bernetti, knows the world, and has only accepted the cardinal's hat with some reserve. He has refused to be ordained, and might marry to-morrow if he returned the hat. He believes in revolutions, he even conceives the possibility that he may see the temporal power of the Pope destroyed if he lives long."¹ We gather from this that Rome had begun to observe the signs of the times; but this observation caused great unrest and anxiety.

But neither Leo XII. nor his Secretary of State lived to see the fall of the Papal States. At Candlemas in 1829 Leo XII. was present in good health and vigour at the festival services in the Sistine chapel, but three days later he was attacked in the evening by an illness, which he had not previously suffered from, and the doctors at once considered his condition serious. On 8th February he began to improve, and those around him were again hopeful, but in the evening the pains increased and on Monday, the 9th, he asked for the sacrament of Extreme Unction. Mgr. Barbolani, who administered the sacrament, fainted, and the Pope himself anointed his own eyelids. Towards evening he fell into a deep slumber, and while he slept, the Grand Penitentiary, Cardinal Castiglioni, and another prelate prayed by his bed. At half past three o'clock in the afternoon of the next day (10th February) he gave up the ghost.²

The news of his death, according to Bunsen, was received in Rome "with indecent joy."³ The popular witticism said that Leo XII. had caused the Romans three great misfortunes, by accepting the Papacy, by living so long, and by dying in carnival time with a view to being mourned for.⁴ And even the Abate Coppi reports of him, that the manifestations of respect with which the people had been used to greet a pope ceased under Leo XII., and that after his death many satires were directed against him which the authorities in vain endeavoured to suppress.⁵ But his burial was celebrated with

¹ *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* IV, 509f.

² The above account is based upon a letter which Leo XIII., as a young man, wrote to his brother on 20th February 1829. *Revue de Paris*, 15th April 1895, 674f.

³ Bunsen I, 360.

⁴ Della Gattina IV, 367.

⁵ Coppi V, 423f. *Revue de Paris*, 680.

the greatest splendour. The learned librarian, Angelo Mai, delivered an eulogy over him in St Peter's,¹ and in the Chapel of the Sacrament, where his body lay in state, a colossal pyramid was erected with two large bas-reliefs in glorification of the year of Jubilee, and of Leo XII.'s care for the University.

¹ *Revue de Paris*, 678.

CHAPTER XV

PIUS VIII.—A PAPACY OF TWENTY MONTHS

ON 22nd February 1829 the last *Dies irae* was sung beside the catafalque of Leo XII., and on the following day thirty-two cardinals went in the usual solemn procession from San Silvestro to the Quirinal. Five others, amongst them Bernetti and Rivarola, preferred, probably from fear, to be quietly conveyed apart to the Monte Cavallo.

Pasquino ridiculed this Conclave in carnival time :

“Conclave in Carnevale ! oh cosa bella ;
Ci daranno per papa un pulcinella.”¹

But a large crowd of people was afoot on 23rd February. It was rumoured that the secret societies had formed plots against the cardinals to attack them when they went into the Conclave, and numerous arrests had taken place during the days immediately preceding. Five hundred civic guards were under arms, patrols of soldiers went up and down the streets, and constables were distributed amongst the crowds.² The public peace, however, was not disturbed.

The envoys of the foreign powers did not look forward to the coming election with great expectations. Chateaubriand, who at the time of the last Conclave had been the Foreign Minister of France, had in 1828 succeeded the Duke of Montmorency-Laval as French ambassador at Rome. Before the death of Leo XII. he had already told his government that it would be the only salvation for Rome, if there came a pope who had the courage to appoint a number of younger cardinals, ready to place a young and strong man in the

¹ Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 367 ; cp. Coppi V, 424f.

² G. Pecci's letter of 26th February 1829 in the *Revue de Paris*, 679.

chair of St Peter.¹ But there seemed no prospect of that. The steering of St Peter's ship would apparently for an incalculable time to come fall to the lot of old men surrounded by men on the verge of the grave. Chateaubriand saw with envy that the ambassadors of Austria and Spain were the only agents and correspondents for the Austrian and Spanish prelates, and that they had the right to remove any cleric of their nation who put any hindrance in their way. Amongst the French cardinals, on the contrary, there was more than one who preferred to act on his own initiative, and to make intrigues behind the back of the ministry and of the ambassador. On 3rd March Chateaubriand sent the French Foreign Minister a despatch² in which he wrote: "I will render the French cardinals all the services I can. If they ask me things that will be good for them to know, I will tell them what I know. If you will send me the King's orders as to the Conclave, I will communicate these to them. But if the cardinals come here with a hostile feeling towards the views entertained by His Majesty's government, if it becomes evident that they are not in accordance with the King's ambassador, if they speak a different language from me, if they go so far as to vote in the Conclave for some extreme man; or if they disagree among themselves, it will be very detrimental. It would be of greater benefit to the King's service if I begged to be recalled for the moment, than that our discord should become a public spectacle."

In order to get the French cardinals under his influence, Chateaubriand wished that they should live in the French embassy, although it cost a great deal of money to entertain such guests and their retinue. He was much occupied with the difficulty he had to solve, and he counted the former diplomatic tasks that had been confided to him as nothing in comparison with this. He was to influence an invisible society which was locked up in a prison with strictly guarded gates; he had neither money nor benefices to give away, and he had to face the passions of fifty infirm old men, in a struggle with stupidity, ignorance, fanaticism, cunning, and duplicity. The coming Conclave would be especially difficult, because religious

¹ *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* V, 55.

² Printed in the work just mentioned V, 94.

questions were now being mixed up with political ones. The choice of a Head of the Church could never in his opinion have fallen at a more inopportune moment.¹

The Sardinian ambassador at Rome, the Marchese Crosa, who sympathised with the *Zelanti*, was also displeased at the prospect of a new conclave. Shortly after its conclusion, he wrote home to his government, "that more than one of those who fear God, and are true-hearted, have complained that it is not possible for a man of character, honesty, and true religion to take part in a conclave more than once in his life, without being compelled to do so by his duties."²

The Conclave of 1829 was, in its composition, not very different from that of 1823. Leo XII. had been very sparing in the giving away of the hat, and his choice had not fallen upon important men; only a single one of the cardinals whom he had appointed, his old opponent, Cristaldi, who had played a great part as leader of the *Zelanti*, was sufficiently respected to be able to aspire to the tiara.

Sixteen cardinals immediately put a St Andrew's cross on the doors of their cells, as a sign that they did not wish to discuss with anybody, because they had firmly made up their minds whom to give their votes to. A majority, mostly consisting of Italians, were bent upon choosing a *Zelante*. The moderate party, which had been pretty strong in the last conclave, was weak in this, because it was without a leader. Consalvi was very much missed, and there was no one of his political school who had sufficient influence to be effective.

It very soon became evident that the contest would chiefly centre round four cardinals: Di Gregorio, Pacca, Cappellari, and Castiglioni. In the instruction, which the French Foreign Minister, Count Portalis, issued on behalf of Charles X. to the French cardinals, a wish was expressed for an Italian, who was a moderate *Zelante*, of the type of Leo XII. Castiglioni or Di Gregorio would be preferred, but Brancadoro and Zurla would also be *personæ gratæ*. On the other hand, the French government could feel nothing but anxiety at seeing Giustiniani in St Peter's chair, on account of the extreme Zelantism he had displayed as nuncio at Madrid. Further,

¹ *Op. cit.* V, 98f.

² Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 383.

there ought not to be any idea of Della Somaglia being elected; he was a shadow that would disappear at the first breath of wind, and everything ought to be done to secure that Bernetti should continue as Secretary of State under the new Pope.¹ Austria also desired a moderate man, of course preferably one who would, as Chateaubriand satirically expressed it, be weak in relation to the Court of Vienna. The aged Cardinal Albani was to be the confidential agent of the Austrian government in the Conclave, as he had been in 1823; and since he was a personal enemy of Di Gregorio it was certain that Di Gregorio's election would meet with resistance from Austria.

The *aura* of Di Gregorio was immediately evident, and on 6th March he received twenty-four votes, so that his enemies had to be prepared for the worst. The conclavist of the Cardinal Bishop of Novara, the Piedmontese Pietro Dardano, who has left us a diary of his experiences during this and the following Conclave,² relates that there was a great stir on that day amongst the cardinals. They put their heads together and forgot, with one solitary exception, to adore the Sacrament which was exposed, and to use their rosaries.³ As usual the secrets of the Conclave oozed out in the city of Rome, and on the morning of 7th March the Romans streamed up to the Monte Cavallo, because the rumour was current that Di Gregorio had been elected Pope. But the smoke of the burned voting papers which rose up from the chimney of the Conclave showed that the rumour was false,⁴ and on that very day Di Gregorio's enemy, Cardinal Albani, made his entry into the Conclave.

When he arrived, the tide turned against Di Gregorio. On the evening of 6th March Di Gregorio had only nineteen votes; on the morning of the 7th only thirteen, but on the 8th, in the evening, he had again twenty.⁵ The change in the voting

¹ Printed in Bianchi II, 422f.

² Published by D. Silvagni, first by itself, afterwards in his *La corte e la società Romana nei secoli XVIII. e XIX.* (Roma 1885) III, 261f.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 274.

⁴ G. Pecci's letter of 7th March in the *Revue de Paris*, 680.

⁵ Silvagni, 275f. The honest Dardano, who looked upon everything from the conclavist's point of view, was of opinion that the reduction of votes was due to an impression that Di Gregorio refused to sign a document acknowledging the claims of

was no doubt due to Albani's agitation, and to influence from outside. Chateaubriand tells us that as soon as a cardinal has been locked up in the Conclave he and his servants, directly darkness sets in, begin secretly to make a hole in the wall of the Conclave, in order to be in communication with the outer world by the help of a string let down.¹ As soon as it seemed probable that Di Gregorio would be elected, the conclavist of the Neapolitan Cardinal Ruffo Scilla put himself into communication with the Neapolitan ambassador in Rome, and told him what was imminent. Di Gregorio was supposed to be an illegitimate son of Carlos VI. of Spain; his mother, Maria Giuseppa Verdupa y Quiado, was said to have had a *liaison* with that prince when he was King Carlo III. of Naples.² As the election of Di Gregorio would be very displeasing to Naples, the Neapolitan ambassador sent a letter in answer to Ruffo Scilla's conclavist in which he accused Di Gregorio of severity and of a weakness for the Liberals, of whose leaders several were his friends.³ Cardinal Albani used this document to excite feelings against Di Gregorio; but there were so many cardinals who supported him that Albani's efforts to begin with had but little success.

On 9th March the Austrian ambassador went in a brilliant procession through the streets of Rome to Monte Cavallo to pay his respects to the Conclave, and to present two letters from his Emperor to the assembled cardinals; the one expressed his regret for the death of Leo XII., the other contained Count Lützow's credentials as ambassador at the Conclave. On this occasion the imperial ambassador delivered a long speech before the window of the Conclave—"in mediocre Latin and with an extraordinarily bad pronunciation," says the critical Dardano⁴—and he impressed on the cardinals to elect "a wise and moderate pope," who would walk in the steps of Leo XII.⁵

On the following day Chateaubriand came to the grated

the conclavists and the servants of the Conclave to various rewards after the close of the Conclave.

¹ *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* V, 86.

² Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 380; cp. Silvagni III, 231.

³ Bianchi II, 220.

⁴ Silvagni III, 277.

⁵ The speech is in Artaud de Montor: *Histoire du Pape Pie VIII.* (Paris 1844),

window and delivered a flowery speech, which was worthy of the author of *Le Génie du Christianisme*. He "would not let the cardinals hear the language of a narrow-minded policy"—but would give them a little advice. "At the moment in which I am speaking," he said, "the human race has reached one of the important epochs in its existence. Christianity still exists to grapple with it. Christianity holds in its bosom everything that appeals to educated spirits and noble hearts, everything that is necessary for the world, which it has saved from the corruptions of heathenism and from the ravages of barbarism." He impressed upon the Conclave to elect a man who had an insight into the needs of the present and of the future; in other words, a moderate pontiff like Leo XII.¹

Cardinal Castiglioni was on that day a member of the committee which received the ambassadors on behalf of the Conclave, and it fell to him to answer. He told Chateaubriand, that the Catholic Church was elevated above all human societies and all secular revolutions; she might indeed experience sufferings, but she would never be suppressed. Then Castiglioni spoke of the problems of the Papacy in a language that called to mind the days of Humanism and Leo X: "From his elevated station the Pope must show foreign admirers the old and the new glory of Rome, besides the many monuments, especially the Vatican and the venerable Propaganda, in order to refute those who accuse Rome of being an enemy of enlightenment and of art. The Vatican will prove that all arts in brotherly union have reached the highest perfection in Rome; in the Propaganda the help that has been given to scientific discoveries will be recognised, as well as the progress in human knowledge and in the civilisation of savage races." The eloquent cardinal finally flattered the vain ambassador to such an extent, that Chateaubriand wrote to Madame Récamier, that she had never, in the days when she spoiled him, paid him more compliments than those he had heard from the mouth of Cardinal Castiglioni, in the presence of the whole Conclave.² The dialogue between Chateaubriand and the Conclave was much discussed, and the ultramontane papers in Paris attacked the French ambassador

¹ The speech in Artaud, 42f.

² *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* V, 103; cp. 108.

for his too "Liberal" expressions. But Stendhal (H. Beyle), who was in Rome during the Conclave, says that Chateaubriand's speech called forth general admiration there; the only fault was that there was a too liberal use of *je* and *moi* in it.¹

Since Austria and France were agreed that the new pope ought to be a moderate man, the cardinals had to submit to this demand. But it was difficult to find a candidate who was in equal degree a *persona grata* at Vienna and at Paris, and during this Conclave, as in others, the usual intrigues were carried on. In order to strengthen the *Zelanti*, the papal nuncio at Paris, Lambruschini, as the go-between of the cardinals and the extreme ultramontane clique in the French capital—which had moreover considerable support at Court—had striven to get read out in the Conclave certain secret instructions to the French cardinal, Latil, of a different import from the above-mentioned ministerial instructions to the French cardinals. The majority of the Conclave, however, expressed itself strongly against such intrigues, and told Lambruschini that he ought to break with people who brought disturbance into France, and who might easily make the Catholic religion hated by all Frenchmen. Chateaubriand, who was much annoyed by this insult to his dignity and to that of the ministry, promised the French Foreign Minister that after the end of the Conclave he would procure authentic information, which would show the King who were his friends and his enemies there, and supply the government with valuable facts that could be relied upon.² It was the men of the July ordinances who tried their wings upon this intrigue, the object of which was to strengthen the power of the Jesuit clique at home and abroad.

But it was far easier for the cardinals to renounce an adventurous policy in the Conclave than to agree upon the choice of a new pope. After the middle of March, Pacca appeared as a candidate, but many were afraid of his notorious nepotism, and, according to the general opinion, he was beginning to enter upon his second childhood. Nevertheless, on the morning of 21st March he obtained nineteen votes, though he never received more. On the evening of the 22nd a "triduum" of prayers to the Madonna was begun. "It will

¹ Silvagni III, 285.

² *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* V, 97; cp. II5.

work miracles," wrote Dardano in his diary.¹ On the next day Cappellari's *aura* began to rise; but Castiglioni steadily obtained more and more votes, although it was rumoured that out of humility he had refused the tiara. And Di Gregorio still had a good chance; on the 26th he obtained twenty-four votes. But Albani still worked energetically to avert his election—so energetically, that Chateaubriand was afraid that the intriguing cardinal cherished a wish to ascend the vacant chair himself. This contingency disturbed him greatly. Albani was, to his mind, only a rough and violent Italian, who out of avarice and love of speculation meddled in all affairs,² and, in order to hinder his election, he took a bold step, of which he was afterwards very proud. On his own responsibility, without having obtained permission from his government, he empowered the Cardinal-Archbishop Clermont-Tonnerre, who did not join the Conclave until 28th March, solemnly to veto the confidential agent of Austria.³

Chateaubriand undoubtedly misunderstood Albani; his ambition went in another direction. He did not want to be Pope but Secretary of State. This end he could not attain if either Di Gregorio or Cappellari were elected; he therefore made out that it was probable that the Viennese Court would object to these two cardinals. Castiglioni, on the other hand, would scarcely cause any trouble, and all difficulties could be surmounted, if this last-named cardinal were to become Pope with Albani as Secretary of State. Castiglioni was the candidate of France, Albani a true follower of the Viennese Court; and from a political point of view it might be doubtful, whether it was better to have a weak pope or an intriguing Secretary of State on one's side. The preferment of Castiglioni and Albani carried with it likewise the advantage, that a couple of much desired dignities and benefices would thereby become available for the satisfaction of the less high-pitched ambition of two other cardinals.

On the morning of 31st March, Castiglioni obtained twenty-eight votes, and when this number was reached, six more cardinals joined the twenty-eight *per accesso*. As there were

¹ Silvagni III, 294.

² *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* V, 108.

³ The veto is printed in *op. cit.* V, 111 ff.

then fifty cardinals in the Conclave, thirty-four votes were enough, and Castiglioni was thus elected. But he demanded a fresh vote, because it appeared from a closer scrutiny of the voting papers that two of them were invalid. At the new voting he obtained forty-seven votes; two cardinals voted still for Di Gregorio, and Castiglioni himself gave his vote to Franzoni.¹

The new Pope, out of gratitude to Pius VII., took the name of Pius VIII., and shortly after the election Albani, supported by four other cardinals, appeared on the Loggia of the Quirinal to communicate to the crowd the glad tidings that the widowhood of the Church was at an end. Great shouts of joy greeted his communication. Contrary to custom—probably on account of a continuous downpour of rain—the procession to St Peter's church for the purpose of doing homage was postponed until the following day. Pius VIII. then drove with Della Somaglia and Galeffi, amid great enthusiasm on the part of the people, from the Quirinal to St Peter's, and as soon as the new Pope reached the church he was placed in a *sedia gestatoria* and carried to the Chapel of the Sacrament. The cheers of the people touched the soft-hearted Pius so much that he wept, and his emotion extended to some of those present. But others, like Massimo d'Azeglio, who saw him weep, thought: "You are not the man to set this country on a firm footing. We need something more than tears."² And the new Pope's soft heart soon became a butt for the satires of the Romans. "What is the Pope doing?" they asked, and the answer was: "He is asleep; but hush! hush! else he will wake up and will cry."³

From the Chapel of the Sacrament Pius VIII. was carried to the high altar of the church, and sat upon it to receive the homage of all the cardinals, who fell on their knees and kissed his foot. Then the procession returned to the Quirinal, and the joy of the people was as great as on the outward journey. In the crowd stood the predecessor of the present Pope, then a youth of nineteen. He observed

¹ The despatch of Crosa of 31st March 1829, in Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 381; cp. Coppi V, 425, and Silvagni III, 303.

² Massimo d'Azeglio: *I miei ricordi* (Firenze 1867) II, 308.

³ [H. Reuchlin]; *Bilder und Skizzen aus Rom*, 172.

with pleasure that it was his old mathematical master, Don Bizarri di Baliano, who carried the cross before the new Pope, and he thought he remembered that Castiglioni once as Vicar-General of the Bishop of Anagni had visited his paternal home at Carpineto. If he were not mistaken, "this happy incident," as he wrote in a letter to his brother, ought to be commemorated by an inscription on the walls of the house.¹

Dardano relates that in spite of the joyful shouting, there was no great satisfaction in Rome,² and the young Pecci does not conceal the fact that opinions were much divided respecting the new Pope. The politicians especially, according to him, were not pleased because they had altogether given up the hope of good order in the Papal States. Shortly after the election, Metternich wrote to Tatistscheff: "Against the election of the Cardinal there is nothing to be said; it remains to be seen whether the Pope will be like the Cardinal. His answer to the ambassadors³ shows that he does not lack sound political principles, and he is in any case not a *carbonaro* Pope."⁴ Chateaubriand expressed himself still more unreservedly. On the same evening that Pius VIII. was elected, he wrote to Madame Récamier: "Victoria! I have got one of the popes whom I had put on my list. . . . Castiglioni is moderate, and devoted to France; it is a complete victory."⁵ In his joy at the happy result of the election, he invited Cardinal Fesch, "who had behaved well during the Conclave" (which means that he had voted with the French cardinals) to the dinner which he gave to the members of the Conclave. But Fesch declined the invitation, having a presentiment that the pleasantness of the moment was no guarantee against unpleasantnesses in the future.⁶ It was not long since one of Chateaubriand's predecessors had told Napoleon's uncle that he would go headlong down the stairs if he dared to show himself in the French embassy.

¹ G. Pecci's letter of 2nd April 1829, in the *Revue de Paris* 683f.

² "Spirito di torpore in Roma, equivalente alla poca contentezza."—Silvagni III, 304.

³ See above, p. 36.

⁴ Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* IV, 584.

⁵ *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* V, 197.

⁶ His letter is in the book just mentioned, V, 130f.

Francesco Xavier Castiglioni¹ was born at Cingoli on 20th November 1761. He at first attended the schools of the Jesuits, and had Padre Zaccaria for his master. Afterwards he went to Bologna to study canon law, and from thence to Rome. There he came into close connexion with one of the most learned canonists of the time, the advocate Devoti, and he assisted him in the edition of the *Institutiones juris canonici*, which was published in 1792. Devoti was by that time appointed Bishop of Anagni, and when he went there he took the young Castiglioni with him as vicar-general. After having been for some time with the Bishop of Fano, Severoli, in the same capacity, Castiglioni returned to his native town. In 1800, Pius VII. appointed him to be Bishop of Montalto in the marches, and afterwards Bishop of Cesena. There he showed himself a friend of the *Sanfedisti*, and an enemy of the *Carbonari*. Farini, who had read several of his letters of that period, considers him to have been too fanatical.² As he would not submit to Napoleon after the French conquest of Italy, he was thrown into prison; but after the fall of the Emperor he was released, and as a reward for the tribulations which he had suffered, he was created a cardinal. As such he lived for several years at Rome in retirement, but Pius VII., the year before he died, made him Bishop of Frascati and Grand Penitentiary; afterwards he became prefect of the Congregation of the Index.

Castiglioni was a learned man, who had given serious study to numismatics and to Biblical literature, besides the canon law, and he was amiable in his intercourse with others. His appearance was not so attractive as that of Pius VII.; he had a chronic affection in the neck which compelled him to hold his head bent and on one side, so that the whole of his face could not be seen. "His gait is light, almost like a dance," wrote Gioacchino Pecci to his brother.³ Immediately after his election he forbade his family to leave their places, in order to avoid any form of nepotism. He even went so far as to feel scruples for a while about creating St Bernard *doctor*

¹ Coppi: *Annali d'Italia* (Roma 1851) VIII, 27f. Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 386f. Artaud, 10f., and Wiseman, 359f.

² L. C. Farini: *Lo stato Romano* I, 26.

³ *Revue de Paris*, 684.

ecclesiæ, because the great mystic belonged to the French family of Chatillon, a branch of the Castiglioni. Afterwards these scruples were overcome, and Bernard of Clairvaux obtained the honour which was his due.

An official document, issued by the secretary of the Conclave, contained the words: "Pius VIII. has decided to appoint Cardinal Albani Secretary of State in order, at the same time, to satisfy the Cabinet of Vienna."¹ After quoting these words, Chateaubriand writes: "The Pope divides the lots between the two crowns; he declares himself to be the Pope of France, and gives the Secretaryship of State to Austria."

This view of the situation was undoubtedly correct. Cardinal Albani had twice been the agent of Austria in the conclaves, and it was well known that in spite of his great riches he received an annual pension from Metternich, for which reason Chateaubriand scornfully called him an Austrian *chargé d'affaires*. Without this intimate connexion with the Imperial Court, which then had great influence in Italy, he would never have had any chance of the post of secretary. He was generally believed to be quite indifferent as to religion; he had never been ordained priest, and for a time he had thought of marrying in order to send his proud family name down to posterity; it died out with him. It was well known that he was very tired of reading Lenten letters and pastorals, and a great lover of the pleasures of the table, of women, and of theatrical performances. A couple of years after the election of Pius VIII., when the female singer, Malibran, charmed the emotional Italians, Albani was present every evening in the theatre, and none was more enthusiastic over her "Norma" than the cardinal of eighty-three.² A man like Gino Capponi held the same view of Albani as Chateaubriand; he accuses him of being avaricious, "incorrect in his morals and his speech," haughty and violent, and says that there was nothing whatever of the priest about him.³ Next to his greed his arrogance had made him specially disliked. When he entered the Conclave on 7th March 1829, and made deep bows to the

¹ Chateaubriand: *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* V, 116.

² *Op. cit.* V, 134. Silvagni III, 235f. Cp. also A. von Reumont: *Beiträge zur ital. Geschichte* V, 346f.

³ A. von Reumont: *Gino Capponi* (Gotha 1880), 141.

assembled cardinals, they all smiled and whispered scoffingly to each other: "*Servo umilissimo*," and Dardano thought he was like a fox, and a courtier who was capable of anything.¹

When Chateaubriand called on the new secretary for the first time, on the morning of 1st April, shortly before Pius VIII. was to be "adored" in St Peter's, Albani received him with the exclamation: "I am a pig!" and Chateaubriand affirms that he really was very dirty. Albani then said: "You shall see that I am no enemy (to France)." When Chateaubriand in reply remarked that he was far from counting the Cardinal amongst the enemies of France, Albani continued: "People like you must have water and not fire. Ought I not to know your country? Have I not lived in France? You shall be satisfied, and your sovereign also. How is the King? Good morning! Let us go to St Peter's."

It can easily be understood that a diplomatist like Chateaubriand was somewhat astonished at such a *début*, and he seems to have undertaken the political education of the old cardinal. Gino Capponi, in Chateaubriand's *salon* in the Palazzo del Drago, saw the poet diplomatist, forgetful of his duties as host, throw himself into the attitude of a speaker, and lecture the new Secretary of State about all the reforms that were needed in the Papal States, as regards the police, the nuisance of the brigands, the state of the prisons, the Campagna, and much besides. The lecture became a little too long for the old man, and he interrupted the poet of "Atala" by saying in a cynical tone: "M. l'ambassadeur, such things have been, they exist, and they will continue to exist. Matters of that kind neither you nor I can alter, and, at this moment, we have other things to think of."²

The reign of Pius VIII. lasted so short a time that the aged Secretary of State found neither many nor great problems to solve. The hated *Congregazione di Vigilanza* was immediately abolished and Leo XII.'s system of espionage was entirely given up.³ The new Pope began his government with an encyclical, which condemned indifference in matters of belief, the Bible Societies, and the secret associations.⁴ The

¹ Silvagni III, 276.

² A. von Reumont: *Gino Capponi*, 142.

³ Coppi: *Annali d'Italia* VIII, 425. See above, p. 25.

⁴ *Bullarium Romanum* XVIII, 17f.

encyclical concluded with a prayer to the Blessed Virgin as the vanquisher of all heresies.¹

About ten days after the accession of Pius VIII. (13th April) Catholic Emancipation was passed in the English Parliament, and in consequence, Parliament and nearly all offices were for the future open to every Catholic in Great Britain, upon taking a civil oath which could not present any difficulties. The rejoicing over this victory in Rome was great, but no doubt it was only a minority of the inhabitants of the city who had a clear perception of the meaning of the two words, *Emancipazione Cattolica*, which were seen everywhere in inscriptions and in transparencies when the news of the victory in England reached Rome. And Chateaubriand said to Bunsen: "On behalf of human nature I must rejoice over this event, but as a Catholic I regret it. For the Church in its joy and triumph may easily forget its usual prudence, and thus prepare dangers for itself in the future."²

Bunsen himself, on behalf of the Prussian government, was carrying on important dealings with the Roman Curia. They were concerned with mixed marriages.³ Benedict XIV. in his time had called such marriages "abominable," and declared that they could never be approved of by the Roman See; but he had, on the other hand, permitted dispensations to be given for them, because it had to be admitted that they violated neither God's law nor the law of nature. Frederic II. of Prussia had afterwards ordained, according to an arrangement with the Prince-Bishop of Breslau, that in mixed marriages the sons were to follow the father's religion, the daughters the mother's, and Catholic priests in Silesia had even sometimes married couples of different denominations without having obtained clear promises as regards the denominational education of the children. Consalvi had said to the Baron von Gagern on this subject: "We know that it takes place, but we are glad when we are not compelled to be aware of it, and we willingly shut our eyes when the bishops and other

¹ "Quam solam interemisse cunctas hæreses confitemur."

² Bunsen I, 363.

³ K. Hase: *Handbuch der protestant. Polemik* (Leipzig 1890), 562f. Cp. Bunsen, 289f.

authorities act on their own account. But actually to approve of it—Never!”

In Prussia it was decided by law in 1803 that all legitimate children were to be educated in the religion of the father, unless the parents were otherwise agreed. When the bridegroom was a Catholic, Rome had, of course, no reason to complain of this law. But where he was a Protestant, the Roman Catholic priest, who, as belonging to the bride's denomination, according to the law of the land was to perform the ceremony, not infrequently made difficulties. Often a solemnisation of marriage was refused, until the bridegroom had agreed that all the children were to be educated in the faith of the mother. By means of such “a silent reformation,” the Catholics of Silesia and the Rhine provinces endeavoured to diminish the number of Protestants amongst them, and Catholic papers already began to calculate how long it would be before Protestantism would be quite stamped out in these districts. But an order of the Cabinet in the year 1825 enjoined that the law of 1803 should have full force in Silesia and on the Rhine, as well as elsewhere, and denied the right of the Roman priests to demand the education of all the children in the faith of the Roman Church. Against this order the rising Ultramontanism on the Rhine made remonstrances, and the Prussian bishops, especially Archbishop Spiegel of Cologne, advised the Prussian government to endeavour to come to an agreement with Rome.

Pius VIII., who was well versed in canon law, took a personal and active part in these deliberations, and Archbishop Spiegel, who was far from being an ultramontane fanatic,¹ followed them with the greatest attention. At last Pius VIII. issued a brief on 25th March 1830 to the bishops of West Prussia,² which was very ambiguously worded. The meaning of it was, that Rome only reluctantly sanctioned mixed marriages, and that she would rather prevent them if she had the power. The Church should therefore earnestly warn the Roman Catholic bride, who intended to marry a Protestant; but if the warning had not the desired effect, the Church might for the sake of peace forbear to inflict the ecclesiastical punishment which was

¹ Cp. Fr. Nippold: *Die vertrauten Briefe des Erzb. Spiegel von Köln* (Barmen 1889) and Bunsen I, 370f.

² Rheinwald: *Acta hist.-eccles. seculi XIX.* for 1835, 15f.

deserved. In order to avoid injuring the Catholic cause, the priest might also be allowed to give an *assistentia passiva* at such marriages, but he was to refrain from anything that might seem to be an approbation of a mixed marriage, and not to accompany it with any holy prayers. Pius VIII. had declared to Bunsen that he had to "leap over many graves" in order to advance so far, and that he had reached a goal which formerly he had not thought it possible to reach.¹ But Bunsen's diplomatic victory was in reality of very doubtful value, and it was not long before the controversy as to mixed marriages broke out again in the Rhineland.

The news of the Revolution of July 1830 caused both joy and dismay in the Papal States. The *Sanfedisti* had formerly greeted the Polignac ministry with the greatest enthusiasm; the Liberal inhabitants of the Papal States now rejoiced over its fall;² but the Pope wept. "People say," wrote Gioacchino Pecci at the beginning of August 1830 to his brother, "that our good Pius VIII. immediately began to weep, and that he sheds tears constantly over the misfortunes of France."³ The papal nuncio, Lambruschini, had again been busy. From the nuncio's office in Paris had proceeded an instigation to publish the five ordinances of July, and Prince Polignac had more and more drifted into the power of the Ultramontanes. A long imprisonment had left lasting marks on the spirit of this reactionary statesman. He had become a visionary, who believed that the heavenly powers every day inspired him as to what he should do,⁴ and during the crisis that preceded the July ordinances, he had told Charles X. that the Blessed Virgin had appeared to him, advised him to proceed, and promised him her help.⁵ The Madonna was thus made an accomplice in the publication of the ordinances of July.

Lambruschini and some of the higher French clergy took up a distinctly hostile position towards the monarchy of July.⁶ Even before the ordinances were published there were bishops

¹ Bunsen I, 373.

² Farini: *Lo stato Romano* I, 27.

³ *Revue de Paris* II, 686f.

⁴ Cp. the account of Berryer at the meeting at Augerville 1856, in Falloux: *L'évêque d'Orléans* (Paris 1879), 102f.

⁵ E. Daudet: *Le ministère de M. de Martignac* (Paris 1875), 321.

⁶ K. Hildebrand: *Geschichte Frankreichs von der Thronbesteigung Louis Philipps* (Gotha 1877) I, 36.

who in pastoral letters rejoiced over the impending *coup d'état* and invoked the assistance of God in masses and processions.¹ But there were other French bishops, who exhorted their clergy to keep entirely aloof from political discussions, in order that they might the better fulfil their spiritual mission, and reminded them that the Church ought not to contend against civil liberty, but only against the ungodliness that accompanied liberty.² There was even a small circle of French abbés and laymen, highly endowed with intellectual gifts, who, according to Frederick Ozanam, looked upon the ancient royalism as "a retired veteran crowned with glory," and dreamt of a Liberal Catholicism, which was to bring about a reconciliation between the Roman Church and free France.

As soon as the new government perceived that the French episcopate was agitating against the monarchy of July, the Foreign Minister, Count Molé, demanded an explanation of Lambruschini. In a friendly conversation with the papal nuncio, Molé showed that the Restoration by its unfortunate ecclesiastical policy had created such a hostile feeling against the clergy that the ministry would gain popularity by attacking the priests.³ But this was not its intention. On the contrary, the new King was animated by a filial love towards the see of St Peter, but he must request that the Pope should publicly disapprove of the hostile attitude of a section of the superior clergy, and should remind the French priests of the duty of obedience towards the civil government.⁴

This appeal bore immediate fruit. In spite of Lambruschini's personal sympathy with the fallen government, Rome placed herself on the side of the new *régime*; according to the general opinion it was Albani who, contrary to his Conservative principles, had advised Pius VIII. to take this step.⁵ The Archbishop of Besançon and the other French prelates who had sought places

¹ H. Reuchlin: *Das Christenthum in Frankreich* (Hamburg 1837), 190.

² P. Thureau-Dangin: *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet* (Paris 1885), 65f. Cp. the letter of the Bishop of Orléans in Capefigue: *L'Europe depuis l'avènement du roi Louis Philippe* (Paris 1845) III, 140.

³ Cp. Guizot: *Mémoires* (Paris 1859) II, 58, where it is related that mobs in several places had attacked the crosses that were raised during the time of the Restoration in front of the churches.

⁴ Capefigue III, 143f., according to information from Count Molé.

⁵ A. von Reumont: *Beiträge zur ital. Geschichte* V, 347.

of safety in other lands, were ordered to return to France, and even the Jesuits, who had paid a heavy penalty for the mistaken church policy of the Bourbons, now became very eager to win the sympathy of the ruling party in Rome for the monarchy of July. Their efforts were successful. A brief of 29th September 1830¹ commanded the French priests to obey the new King, who cherished the friendliest feeling towards bishops and priests, and Pius VIII. advised Mgr. Quélen, the Archbishop of Paris, to surrender his dignity as peer of the realm, because the clergy ought not, in the Pope's opinion, to interfere in politics.² The Marquis de Latour-Maubourg was thereupon sent to Rome to assure the Pope that Louis Philippe, who as well as Charles X. was a descendant of Saint Louis, would strive against the philosophical party and suppress the revolutionary propaganda. But at the same time, the French envoy recommended the Holy See to introduce a better government in the unsettled Legations.³

When the revolution reached Belgium, there was opened to the Papacy a prospect of greater influence, on account of the part which Ultramontanism came to play in that country as the ally of Liberalism. The revolt in Poland also seemed to promise for the Roman propaganda a more unfettered work amongst the unhappy Poles. It must be reserved for a later sketch of the inner life of the Roman Church to point out how the bright prospects of Rome, as regards Belgium and Poland, were either not fulfilled at all or only fulfilled for a short while. Even in Rome itself there could be noticed a faint echo of the revolution in Paris. A *Carbonaro* lodge was discovered consisting of twenty-six members, but the peace was not disturbed.

In this time of storms "the experienced helmsmen" came more and more to the front. When the Jesuits appeared before the new Pope to receive his blessing, Pius assured them of his affection for the Society of Jesus. "The Church," he said, "cannot separate herself from the Pope, the Pope cannot separate himself from this society."⁴ In July 1829 Jesuits

¹ Printed in Rheinwald: *Acta hist.-eccles. seculi XIX.* for 1835, 15f.

² Exauvillez: *Vie de Mgr. de Quélen* (Paris 1840) II, 45f.; quoted by Thureau-Dangin, 73f.

³ Capefigue III, 319.

⁴ Crétineau-Joly: *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus* VI, 227.

from all parts of the globe assembled in Rome to choose a new general after the death of Aloysius Fortis on 27th January of that year. The choice lay between the Frenchman, Rozaven, and the Dutchman, John Philip Roothaan. Roothaan was elected, and in him the order obtained a chief of the usual type. Roothaan, who was born at Amsterdam in 1785, had gone to Russia in 1804, where, at Dünaburg, he had been enrolled as a novice in Loyola's order,¹ and he embraced the order and the peculiar piety which is fostered by it, with the greatest enthusiasm.² He possessed adroitness, knowledge of men, learning, and political insight; and under his calm and cold exterior burned the sacred fire of religious fanaticism.

The assembled Jesuits did not separate immediately after the election, but remained together for a time to take counsel as to the best mode of action in the different countries where the Roman Church was in danger. The only thing that transpired to the outer world was that Roothaan had chosen four assistants for the four provinces of the order—Gaul, Spain, Germany, and Italy. And there were signs which portended new victories for the revived order. On 2nd December 1829 the feast of St Francis Xavier, Pius VIII. visited the church of the Jesuits in Rome, accompanied by the Cardinals Della Somaglia and Odescalchi, and after praying at the altar of Xavier the Pope read a decree which removed the last obstacle in the way of the canonisation of Alfonso de' Liguori, by confirming the miracles which this friend of the Jesuits was said to have performed.³ Cardinal Odescalchi, who accompanied the Pope, had already conceived the secret wish to surrender the purple in order to become a Jesuit. It was nine years before he obtained permission to follow his heart's desire, and exchanged at Modena the red dress of a cardinal for the black clothes of a Jesuit novice.

Pius VIII. had always had poor health; he had therefore taken only a small part in the festal services of the Church.

¹ Cp. his letter in J. Alberdingk-Thijm: *Levensschets van P. Joan. Roothaan* (Amsterdam 1885), 19f.

² See his *Rondgaande brieven over de vereering van het Allerheiligste Hart van Jesus*; see *op. cit.*, 165.

³ Bull of canonisation in Capecelatro: *Sant' Alfonso Maria de' Liguori* II, 590. Crétineau-Joly VI, 227f.

On Easter Day 1830, however, he was well enough to bless the people. The young German historian, Karl Hase, saw the fragile Pope, with his gentle suffering face, summon up his last forces to spread out his arms in blessing over the *urbs et orbis*.¹ During the succeeding months Pius grew weaker and weaker, and on 30th November it was announced in Naples that he was near his end, a prey to delirious fancies about a cross that had appeared in France some years before, while a priest was preaching.² It grieved him in his last moments that he had not been able to issue the Bull for the canonisation of Liguori. Pius VIII. had not been received with any great expectations, and when he died, the Roman popular wit gave him this short epigram for an inscription on his tomb:—

“Nacque—Pianse—Morì.”³

¹ K. Hase: *Erinnerungen an Italien* in his *Gesammelte Werke* XI, 1, 219.

² Luigi Carafa's despatch in Cipolletta, 177.

³ Silvagni III, 428.

CHAPTER XVI

GREGORY XVI

As soon as the eyes of Pius VIII. were closed, the Roman revolutionaries began to stir, hoping that the period of change from one pope to another would be favourable for the execution of their plans.¹ The advocate, Giuseppe Cannonieri, from Modena, in conjunction with certain Italians and Corsicans, attempted to set up a revolutionary movement, the ultimate aim of which seems to have been the establishment of an Italian monarchy under Jerome Bonaparte, son of the King of Westphalia, who was then eleven years old. On the night before 10th December the conspirators were to assemble in front of the Vatican in order to force their way to a dépôt of arms; and when the revolutionary troop had first been armed, the Castle of Sant' Angelo was to be occupied, the bank of San Spirito to be looted, the prisons to be opened, and several well-known men to be taken into custody as hostages. By means of the money they had seized, they expected to induce the inhabitants of Rome to participate in the revolt, so that a popular assembly might be gathered on the Capitol, and the little Bonaparte proclaimed as King of Italy.² The Governor of Rome, however, obtained news of the conspiracy, and the whole project came to nothing. Some of the conspirators were imprisoned; others had to fly. The boy for whom they had intended the Italian crown was amongst those who were imprisoned, but on the request of the Russian ambassador he was immediately released.

The Conclave which met amidst these troubled circumstances must be looked upon as a continuation of the Conclave

¹ Farini I, 31f.

² Ch. Sylvain: *Grégoire XVI. et son Pontificat* (Paris 1889), 27f.

of 1829. During the reign of Pius VIII. no great or important changes had taken place in the Sacred College. Two of the cardinals nominated by Pius VIII., the Frenchman, Rohan-Chabot, and the Englishman, Weld, both widowers, for the very reason that they were foreigners could not have any expectations of the tiara, and only one of the three Italians to whom Pius had given the cardinal's hat, Nembrini, could be regarded as a candidate at a papal election.¹

Most of the forty-five cardinals,² who on 14th December went to the Conclave in the Quirinal, gathered round the two old candidates for the papal dignity, Pacca and Di Gregorio. Albani was eager to enlist votes for Pacca; if this old man of eighty, who was now quite in his dotage, attained to the triple crown, Albani might then hope to remain Secretary of State in spite of his eighty years, and thus continue to enjoy the sweets of power. Bernetti worked for Di Gregorio, who still had many friends, and he hoped to obtain the secretaryship if Di Gregorio became Pope, so that at the beginning the strife in the Conclave turned upon the question which of the two ambitious cardinals should be Secretary of State.³

The Catholic powers seemed this time as if they would take up a neutral position. The Neapolitan government, which generally followed the lead of France, enjoined the Neapolitan ambassador at Rome to show the greatest reserve, and only to be careful to keep the Neapolitan Court informed of the proceedings in the Conclave.⁴ The instructions that were given to the Sardinian ambassador were of a similar purport; even in Sardinia they wished to allow the Conclave to go its own way without joining either Austria or the new government of France. The French ambassador, the Marquis de Latour-Maubourg, gave an assurance that his government also, faithful to the principle of non-intervention, would abstain from any interference in the business of the Conclave; but in reality the French representative brought with him a veto against Cardinal Macchi, who had been so intimately connected with

¹ Cp. the Neapolitan ambassador's despatch in Bianchi III, 31f., and Cipolletta, 184f.

² Their names are given in Silvagni III, 429f.

³ Cp. the Neapolitan ambassador's despatch already referred to, and a later one in Cipolletta, 189f.

⁴ Bianchi III, 33.

Charles X. that Louis Philippe could on no account see him ascend the papal throne. Spain too seemed as if she would be an inactive spectator at the coming election; but the Spanish ambassador, the Count Labrador, had received orders from the Queen, Maria Christina, to prevent the election of Cardinal Giustiniani. This cardinal, during his stay in Spain as nuncio, had attached himself so intimately to Don Carlos that Maria Christina had good reason to fear, lest as Pope he should place difficulties in the way of her daughter Isabella's pretension to the Spanish throne.

At the first ballot, the day after the opening of the Conclave, Pacca and Di Gregorio received eight votes each, and outside the Conclave it was expected that the fight would be between those two. The young Gioacchino Pecci was of opinion that Pacca would have the best chance, and that Di Gregorio's party would finally give their votes to him.¹ On 28th December, however, the friends of Di Gregorio showed an inclination to vote for Giustiniani, to the dismay of Albani. At the morning ballot on 29th December, Pacca, Di Gregorio, and Giustiniani had sixteen votes each, and it seemed probable that Giustiniani would obtain still more votes at the next ballot. Under these circumstances Albani considered it best to send one of his henchmen to the esteemed Cardinal Falsacappa, to induce him to take the lead in the intrigues that must now be carried on. But Falsacappa answered that he wished to keep in reserve, and that they must go to others whose influence was greater. Albani then addressed himself to Cardinal Marozzo, whose conclavist Dardano was, and after repeated discussions with him the *aura* of Cappellari began to be perceptible.² On 4th January Dardano was already certain that the Conclave would end in Cappellari being elected.

Bartolommeo Alberto Cappellari was born on 18th September 1765 at Belluno, which at that time was in the domain of the republic of Venice. At the age of eighteen he joined the order of the Camaldulense monks,³ and under the name of Fra Mauro became a member of the monastery of S. Michele at Murano in one of the lagoons to the north of

¹ *Revue de Paris*, 69of.

² Dardano's diary in Silvagni III, 439f.

³ There were also Camaldulense *hermits*.

Venice, where the remains of Paolo Sarpi many years before were laid to rest.¹ It was there that in 1786 he defended a thesis about the infallibility of the Pope in the presence of the Venetian Patriarch, and on account of the acuteness he then displayed, he became, after his ordination as priest, teacher in philosophy and theology at the college on the island of Murano. In 1790 Don Mauro became lector of his order, and the censorship of books about to be printed was entrusted to him. Five years afterwards he accompanied the procurator-general of his order to Rome, to take charge conjointly of the transactions between the Camaldulese and the Holy See.

At Rome he lived first in the small, now demolished, convent which the Camaldulese possessed in the Piazza Venezia; but afterwards he moved to the great monastery of St Gregory on the Cælian Hill, which the disciples of Romuald had inherited from those of Benedict of Nursia. In 1800 he became abbot-vicar; in 1805 abbot of the monastery. His lively mind, and profound knowledge both of theology and of the exact sciences, made him a welcome guest in Imperiali's bookshop at the Arco dei Carbognani, where the famous antiquary, Ennio Visconti, and other men of letters met to discuss learned questions.² In 1799 he made his *début* with the book *Il trionfo della S. Sede*, in which he tried to refute the enemies of the Church by their own weapons, but this apology did not attract much attention. If we may dare to trust Crétineau-Joly, who was very intimate with Don Mauro after he became Pope, the self-critical pontiff once said with a certain amount of humour to the author of the *Histoire de la Vendée militaire*: "As Pope I am your father, but in literature we are brothers. I too am a famous author. Do you know that I have written a splendid book, *Il trionfo della Chiesa*? At first nobody talked about it, not even my brethren in the convent. But now that I am Pope, all are agreed that it is a remarkable work."³

When Napoleon broke with Pius VII., all the monastic orders were dissolved, and the Abbot of St Gregory's was

¹ A. Bianchi Giovini: *Biografia di Fra Paolo Sarpi* (Zurigo 1847) II, 350.

² A. von Reumont: *Don Mauro Cappellari und Gasparo Salvi in his Beiträge zur italienischen Geschichte* II, 346f.

³ Maynard: *J. Crétineau-Joly*, 31.

obliged to leave the Cælian Hill. He found a refuge at Murano, where, in lay dress, together with a brother of his order, Don Placido Zurla, he taught children of noble Italian families. Afterwards he had to remove with the school to Padua, but in 1814 he was able to return to the convent on the Cælian Hill. In the years following he devoted himself again to quiet studies, and in his spare time he frequented the shop of the apothecary, Ricci, in the Forum of Trajan, which was the resort of men of learning, like Fea, Cancellieri, and Scarpellini; and into this circle he introduced his young friend, formerly a barber's apprentice, Gaetano Moroni, who afterwards became his chief confidant.¹

During the Restoration Don Mauro rose from abbot to be the procurator-general and the vicar-general of his order, and his fame was so great, that it attracted painful attention when Pius VII. in 1823 appointed his brother in the order, Zurla, and not him, to be a cardinal. Two years later Leo XII. repaired the fault of his predecessor by giving Don Mauro the cardinal's hat, at the same time that the Capucin Micara received it. The new Camaldulense cardinal was further promoted to be Prefect of the Propaganda, and as such Cappellari took part in several of the negotiations of that period about the Concordats.

It was thus a monastic man of letters, but by no means a monk unacquainted with the world, who at the beginning of 1831 appeared as the rival of Pacca, Di Gregorio, and Giustiniani for the tiara. In the preceding Conclave there had already been some talk of choosing him; now he seemed to be the one who could most easily unite the dissentient cardinals. Albani, however, continued for a time to work for Pacca, and Giustiniani had still an influential party around him. But when Giustiniani received twenty-four votes, the agent of Spain in the Conclave, Cardinal Mario y Catalan, attempted by persuasion to induce the partisans of the reactionary cardinal to vote for another, and as this was not successful, he caught at the veto. On 9th January, before the morning ballot, the Cardinal-Dean read a letter from the Spanish ambassador; it contained a solemn veto against the

¹ Silvagni: *Il confidente di Gregorio XVI.* in the *Nuova Antologia* for 15th November 1883, 267.

election of Giustiniani.¹ As soon as the reading was ended, the excluded cardinal rose from his seat and said that he owed His Catholic Majesty thanks for a benefice, for the Grand Cross of the Order of the Conception, and much more, but above all because the King was now pleased to free him from a heavy burden which he had not sufficient strength to bear. Cardinal Giustiniani's gratitude was no doubt somewhat tempered. On 11th January the Neapolitan ambassador reported to his government that His Eminence, Cardinal Giustiniani, lay sick of a fever;² and there are indications that it was not without a sigh that Giustiniani gave up the prospect of bearing the heavy burden of the Papacy.

As in former conclaves, it was far easier to push a candidate aside than to procure agreement, and even after the Spanish veto against Giustiniani, the parties remained just as sharply opposed to each other as before. Albani would not lose the prospect of keeping the Secretaryship of State, and he told the members of the opposition that if they would not comply with his wishes, they might be obliged to eat Easter eggs in the Conclave.³ His and Pacca's opponents assembled in Giustiniani's cell, and put a cross on the door as a sign that they wished to be undisturbed. After some discussion, they agreed that they would again begin to work for Di Gregorio, if Cappellari's election proved impracticable.⁴ On 12th January, Cappellari obtained twenty votes, and on 15th January as many as twenty-three. But the *Albanisti* and the *Pacchisti* were as immovable as ever, so that it seemed impossible to secure for the Camaldulense cardinal the necessary two-thirds of all the votes.

They then tried the usual expedient of proposing new candidates. Cardinal Micara⁵ succeeded with comparative ease in getting both Pacca and Cappellari to decline the votes of their colleagues, but Albani attempted in vain to arouse a feeling in favour of Macchi or Galeffi. The opposition were of opinion that he only proposed these two because he hoped

¹ Cipolletta, 207. Silvagni III, 443f.

² Cipolletta, 209.

³ Pecci's letter of 11th January in the *Revue de Paris*, 691.

⁴ Bianchi III, 40.

⁵ Bianchi has "Micca," but there was no cardinal of that name in the Conclave. Cp. also Silvagni III, 454f.

to keep the secretaryship if either of them became Pope. Albani had issued a declaration which was also read outside the Conclave,¹ to the effect that he had only worked so hard for Pacca's election because he was persuaded that his aged Eminence would make the most excellent of popes; the idea of securing for himself the Secretaryship of State had been so far from his thoughts that, on the contrary, he was only waiting for a favourable opportunity to retire with honour. Nobody believed him, and the new candidates met with only scant sympathy. Galeffi, in spite of popular favour, was quite impossible, and it was known that France would use the veto against Macchi if his name were seriously brought forward.

The month of January passed without any agreement being reached, and the Romans began to be impatient; it seemed as if the approaching carnival might be spoiled by the irresolution of the cardinals.² But in February things began to look brighter. The ambitious Secretary of State perceived that he must give up the hope of keeping his political position; but he wished this time again *fare il Papa*, and he and Giustiniani put their heads together. On the evening of 1st February, Cappellari got twenty-five votes; and on the next morning early, Albani went to Zurla to tell him that he would no longer oppose Cappellari's election.³ A courier from Modena had brought him a letter from Duke Francesco IV., in which that prince exhorted him, as his own and Austria's friend in the Conclave, to bring the widowhood of the Church to the speediest end possible, because the revolution was about to break out in Central Italy. A pope was badly needed who could invoke the intervention of the Viennese Court.⁴

It was no doubt this letter which at last broke down the obstinacy of the old Secretary of State, and on 2nd February Mauro Cappellari was elected Pope. In honour of the founder of the Propaganda, Gregory XV., he assumed the name of Gregory XVI.

Not many persons were present when Cardinal Albani,

¹ Pecci's letter of 19th January, *Revue de Paris*, 693.

² Pecci's letter of 30th January, *Revue de Paris*, 694.

³ Silvagni III, 457.

⁴ Bianchi III, 41. Cp. also Dardano's Diary for 2nd February in Silvagni, *loc. cit.*

according to Gioacchino Pecci, "a little nervous and with feigned indifference," announced from the Loggia of the Quirinal, "the great joy" (*magnum gaudium*) that the Roman Church had a new Pope.¹ But the sound of cannon soon called the people together, and the new Pope had twice to bless the crowd who had flocked together. The rejoicing, however, was not great. Gioacchino Pecci confides to his brother that the Camaldulense cardinal, with his stern exterior, did not enjoy the favour of the people.² But the diplomatists were satisfied. Metternich at once wrote to Count Lützow that the Sacred College could not have made a choice that was more agreeable to the Emperor. Although the Court of Vienna had refrained from expressing any wish whatever, the name Cappellari was at the bottom of all its hopes and wishes. Metternich then repudiated the insinuation that the reason why the Austrian government was so well pleased, was that the new Pope had been born an Austrian subject;³ he was well aware that a Pope, as temporal sovereign, ought first of all to consider his own subjects, and as prince of the Church to be a father to all the faithful. He concluded by expressing his appreciation of the way in which Cardinal Albani, supported by his worthy colleague, Cardinal Gaysruck, had accomplished his delicate mission amid such difficult and trying circumstances.⁴ The Marquis de Latour-Maubourg was also satisfied. He informed his government that the new Pope had spoken of France and her King with the greatest kindness, and the French papers, especially the *National* and the *Avenir*, greeted the new Pope with much warmth of feeling.⁵

But before Gregory XVI. was crowned a good part of Central Italy was in flames. In the autumn of 1830, Louis Philippe had declared for the principle of non-intervention, and Lafitte, as minister, had announced that France would

¹ *Revue de Paris*, 695.

² Letter of 4th February, *Revue de Paris*, 698.

³ Metternich: *Nachgel. Papiere* V, 145f.

⁴ In reality he was not so, and he appreciated the fact. When Cesare Cantù said during an audience to Gregory XVI. that they were both Austrian subjects, Gregory XVI. answered that in his civic capacity he was born a subject of the venerable republic of Venice, but that as Pope he was nobody's subject.—Silvagni III, 459.

⁵ Sylvain, 34, where there are several cuttings from the French papers.

not suffer any violation of that principle. The smaller States of Italy might therefore hope to obtain permission to settle their own government without the interference of foreign powers. At the end of January 1831, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Count Sebastiani, had expressly confirmed with regard to Poland the utterance of Lafitte, and the Italian patriots accordingly considered that they could rely upon the help of France, in case Austria wished to stop them when they came to reorganise their internal affairs.¹ And there was special need of such a reorganisation in the Italian peninsula. "Seldom, perhaps never," says the Conservative Von Reumont, "has an important political reformation been carried out with such short-sightedness as the reconstitution of Italy at the Congress of Vienna. The consequences of the fundamental error of denying the existence of an Italian nation made their appearance, as might be expected, year by year, more and more strongly. But the symptoms had been evident from the first moment."² Such an event as the Revolution of July could not, therefore, but encourage the hopes of the Italian friends of liberty.

Perhaps it was only in order to keep an eye on the conspiracies of the Italian patriots in the interest of Austria that Francesco IV., Duke of Modena, had been in collusion with Ciro Menotti and other conspirators.³ On the day after the Conclave he considered that the moment had come to strangle the conspiracy at its birth. Ciro Menotti's house in Modena was surrounded by soldiers, and fired upon with a cannon, and in the end Menotti himself and the conspirators who were with him were obliged to surrender at discretion. But when a revolt broke out the next day at the neighbouring town of Reggio and other places, Duke Francesco IV. found it advisable to seek refuge behind the strong walls of Mantua.⁴

It soon became evident, in fact, that the intended revolution at Modena was, as Metternich wrote, part of a great conspiracy, which comprised the whole of Italy.⁵ The Liberals at Bologna had greeted the July days as a repetition of the six days of

¹ Bianchi III, 44f.

² *Gino Capponi*, 53f.

³ Farini I, 28.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 31f.

⁵ Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* V, 148, in a historical note to a despatch of 15th February 1831.

creation, and on 4th February a revolution broke out in that ancient university town. The papal Pro-legate was forced to leave the town, and on 8th February the Italian tricolour was already floating everywhere in token that the sovereignty of the Pope in Bologna was at an end. With the rapidity of lightning, the revolt spread to Romagna, the Marches, and Umbria, and the castle of Ancona fell into the hands of the revolutionaries. To quell the revolt, Cardinal Benvenuti, the Bishop of Osimo, was sent to the disturbed district, and extensive authority was given to him, even to making use of such a doubtful expedient as a counter-revolution of the *Sanfedisti*. But as soon as the Cardinal reached Osimo, he was taken prisoner and conveyed to Bologna, and he had to thank the provisional government of that city that he did not lose his life in the uproar.

In Rome, likewise, a conspiracy was formed, the members of which intended to use the carnival season to capture Sant' Angelo, and proclaim a republic upon the Capitol.¹ During the night between 12th and 13th February about fifty conspirators collected on the Piazza Colonna in front of the house of the Prince of Piombino, where a wedding was being held; but the soldiers drove them away. The next morning tricoloured cockades were found on the Corso and at several other places, with the inscription, "This or Death."² The revolt in Rome emanated chiefly from foreigners, especially from certain Corsican doctors,³ and it was easily quelled—especially as the people of the Trastevere offered to defend Gregory XVI., if they were but supplied with arms. In order to win popular favour, the Pope reduced the duty and tax on salt and flour; new troops were enrolled and several political prisoners released. By these and similar measures, the disturbances in Rome were successfully subdued, but outside the capital the revolutionary waves rose high, and the rebels approached the gates of Rome. The young Napoleon Bonaparte wrote boldly from Terni to the Pope, that the forces of war which were advancing were insuperable; he therefore advised the Pope to surrender his temporal power.⁴ Curiously enough a great number of Bibles were at this period imported

¹ Silvagni III, 363.

² Köberle II, 87f.

³ Silvagni III, 363.

⁴ Coppi VIII, 87.

into the Papal States, whether it were due to the labours of the Bible Societies, or to a religious craving amongst the people.¹ There was also a kind of religious tone in the burning appeal which the President of Bologna, Giovanni Vicini, issued to his fellow-citizens on behalf of the provisional government. In this appeal, the Pope was reminded that although Christ had given to St Peter and to his successors the keys to bind and to loose in spiritual matters, yet the Lord had expressly said that His kingdom was not of this world. The temporal government was an usurpation due to the ambition of the popes, and not to the Divine Founder of the Church.²

Gregory XVI. had immediately taken Bernetti to be Secretary of State, and the clever cardinal would greatly have preferred that the Papal States should help themselves. But it was obviously impossible; the papal army was unable to subdue the revolt. Albani's advice, therefore, was gladly accepted, that they should call in the Austrians, and Metternich was not slow in sending the desired help. Austria had never acknowledged "the so-called principle of non-intervention," and she never would do so. Metternich called it "a phrase,"³ and the Austrian ambassador at Rome had long before obtained permission to promise armed intervention, if it were asked for.⁴ On 19th February, the Austrian general, Frimont, issued a proclamation in which it was stated that the Holy Father, after endeavouring in vain by clemency and indulgence to lead the rebels back to their duty, had appealed to the Austrian emperor;⁵ and on 25th February a strong Austrian army marched by way of Parma and Modena to Bologna. The provisional government had to flee to Ancona,⁶ and Cardinal Benvenuti was carried away with them as a hostage to be used in case of emergency. On 27th March, when every hope seemed extinguished for the rebels, Benvenuti was released, and the conspirators at Ancona made a compact with him, according to which all who had taken part in the revolt were to have amnesty and permission to go wherever they liked, when

¹ Reuchlin: *Geschichte Italiens* I, 231.

² The appeal is given in Farini I, 35f.

³ *Nachgelassene Papiere* V, 151.

⁴ Bianchi III, 49.

⁵ Coppi VIII, 126f.

⁶ Farini I, 47f.

they had laid down their arms.¹ But neither the Austrians nor the Papal Court would recognise the capitulation at Ancona, because the cardinal-legate had evidently not been free when he negotiated with the rebels. Louis Napoleon succeeded in escaping from Ancona, disguised as his mother's servant, and many others preferred to go into exile in spite of the promised amnesty. Two hundred and four of them left for France, eighty-six for Corfu, and three for England.² Those members of the great conspiracy who did not go abroad, were sought out by papal commissions of enquiry, and heavy sentences were imposed upon them; but it is said that nobody was sentenced to death.

It was a great disappointment for the Italian insurgents that the French assertion of the principle of non-intervention proved, as Metternich had foreseen, to be only a phrase. The French ambassador at Rome certainly made remonstrances to the Curia³ against the Austrian march into the Papal States as "a mortal blow to the political system in Italy, and an end to the independence of the Holy See." But in the French Chamber of Deputies Casimir Périer declared that the blood of Frenchmen belonged only to France, and that non-intervention should only be supported by way of diplomacy.⁴ From that side, therefore, no danger threatened Gregory XVI., and on 5th April he sent a circular letter to his dear subjects, full of the greatest gratitude towards the faithful people to whom God had given victory over the impious rebels, who with sacrilegious hands had wished to bring destruction and sorrow over the boundaries of the Levites.⁵

One drawback, however, accompanied the Austrian intervention; it gave the Viennese Court the right to press certain claims upon the Papacy. Bernetti, immediately after the accession of the new Pope, had promised that a fresh era should commence,⁶ and a papal edict of 23rd March announced on the walls of Rome and in all the towns of the Papal States that a new period was at hand, with great improvements in

¹ Coppi VIII, 129f.

² *Ibid.*, 131.

³ *Ibid.*, 134. Bianchi III, 53f. Crosa's despatch of 22nd March 1831.

⁴ Cantù: *Histoire des Italiens* XI, 354f.

⁵ *Bullarium Romanum* XIX, 36f.

⁶ Bianchi III, 78f.

the government. But no copy of the edict was afterwards to be had, and the fair promises were soon forgotten.¹ The shady sides of the papal *régime* were meanwhile so obvious that a sacrifice was obliged to be made to public opinion, and the arbitrariness and unscrupulous embezzlements which Giovanni Vicini in his appeal above mentioned had laid bare with so much energy, could no longer be concealed. The five Great Powers agreed, therefore, to send to the Pope the memorandum of 21st May 1831,² of which so much has been said. Bunsen drafted it on behalf of Prussia, but it was unanimously signed by the representatives in Rome of Austria, Russia, France, and England.³

This memorandum of the great powers demanded reforms not only in the provinces that were threatened by revolution, but also in the undisturbed districts and in the capital. Laymen, it said, ought to have access to the administration, and to the judicial posts; the communes should be governed by councils which they had chosen themselves, and provincial councils ought to be established. Finally, there ought to be a *Giunta* or administrative assembly of notables which would afford a sort of interior guarantee in regard to the changes to which an elective kingdom like the Papacy is of necessity subject. Austria had desired that this memorandum should open with a solemn acknowledgment of the principles of the Conservative policy, and with a promise to maintain the integrity and peace of the Papal States against any kind of revolution; but agreement on this point could not be secured.

The memorandum was accompanied by such strong pressure upon the papal government that something must needs be done, and Bunsen flattered himself for a short time with the hope of seeing his proposals carried into effect. But Bernetti followed the old Roman policy of protracting matters to a great length. Commissions were appointed and reports sent in,⁴ so that it seemed to those outside as if some part of what the

¹ Massimo d'Azeglio: *Die jüngsten Ereignisse in der Romagna* (German translation, Leipzig 1846), 63.

² Printed in Bunsen I, 544f. (with the corresponding points in Bernetti's note of 5th June 1831) and in Farini I, 51f. Cp. Bianchi III, 71f.

³ Bunsen I, 390.

⁴ Amongst others by Coppl, cp. his *Annali* VIII, 143f., "ma il tutto inutilmente."

great powers wished would really be done. But both the Pope and the cardinals were agreed that no concession could possibly be made in a democratic direction to lay people, for if any concession were voluntarily granted, the government would afterwards have no right to withdraw it.¹ The Curia could not possibly allow the people to elect members of the town councils and provincial councils, nor to form a Council of State, consisting of laymen, to stand side by side with the College of Cardinals. And fortunately for Rome, Metternich also began to be doubtful about pressing the Curia too hard. If the memorandum of the powers were carried into effect, it might easily result in a similar criticism being passed upon the Austrian system of government in Italy.² Bernetti therefore soon discovered that the Pope only needed to make few and insignificant concessions to his subjects; and accordingly the inhabitants of the Papal States continued to be excluded from influencing the government of the country.

On the other hand, Gregory XVI. issued on 7th August 1831 a Bull — *Sollicitudo ecclesiarum* — which might have a certain importance for princes and peoples in other lands.³ It contained a declaration to the effect that the Roman see, according to the former practice of the Papacy, would acknowledge governments existing *de facto* without entering upon abstract questions of right. It was, in the first instance, a friendly concession to Dom Miguel in Portugal, who had endeavoured with great earnestness to renew connexion with the Papacy. But some of the Conservative governments were not satisfied with "the neutrality towards certain more recent events" which lay behind the words of the Bull, and the Spanish ambassador to Rome hastened to ask whether the Holy See intended, in accordance with these newly propounded principles, to acknowledge the independence of the South American States, for in that case the Court of Madrid would not receive the papal Bull. Bernetti answered adroitly enough that the Pope had acknowledged the new King of Portugal because he was actually established on the throne; but there could be no question of acknowledging the South American republics because their governments were too

¹ Coppi VIII, 148.

² Bunsen I, 390f.

³ *Bullarium Romanum* XIX, 38f.

unstable.¹ It soon became evident, however, that Dom Miguel was not so secure upon his throne as was imagined at Rome; and when Pedro I. had secured the Portuguese crown for Maria da Gloria, not only Dom Miguel, but also the papal nuncio in Portugal, was expelled. The connexion between Rome and Lisbon was not reopened until 1841, but in 1842 the relations were already so good that Gregory XVI. stood sponsor to a Portuguese prince and sent to Maria da Gloria the Golden Rose.

In 1831 there was much distress in several parts of the Papal States. Commerce and industry, which never flourished even in peaceful days, had come to a standstill during the disturbances, and in Rome the misery was beyond measure. It was the custom for the bread from the bakeries to be laid in baskets, and loaded upon asses, and so taken to the customers; these asses were now frequently attacked, and the bread stolen, amidst cries like: "We will have bread; we are dying of hunger." When Gregory XVI. appeared in the streets, he was surrounded by pale, emaciated figures who handed him petitions; but he had nothing to give. The state treasury was empty, and it became more and more difficult to obtain a loan. Torlonia, who could offer but poor security for the loan which he wished to arrange with Rothschild on behalf of Gregory XVI., had to face great difficulties. At last the Jewish king of finance lent the successor of St Peter in two large loans sufficient to meet the most urgent expenses; but the Pope only received seventy per cent. of the loan in cash, and he had to pledge several of the indirect taxes as a guarantee.² When he died, the state debt had risen to nearly 60,000,000 *scudi*.³

The reforms that were introduced in no way satisfied the people, and when the Austrians retired in July, Gregory XVI. stood face to face with a new revolution. In many cities a town militia was formed to support the Liberal movement, and the *Sanfedisti* stirred up the strictly clerical section of the inhabitants. The provinces sent deputations to Rome which entered into communication with the ambassadors of the foreign powers, in order by their help to compel the Curia to carry out what the great powers had demanded. These deputations from

¹ Sylvain, 117.

² Köberle II, 164f.

³ *Ibid.*, 239.

the provinces asked for arms for the town militias, a reform of the law courts, and the admission of laymen to the leading positions in the government. Bernetti was clever enough neither to promise nor to refuse; only in the matter of judicial reform he made a small concession. It did not, however, satisfy the provinces, and the party which was hostile to the government gained more and more influence in the Legations.

On 21st June¹ Cardinal Albani was sent with extensive authority as Legate to Urbino and Pesaro (the fifth Legation along with Bologna, Ferrara, Ravenna, and Forlì), but this was far from being a fortunate choice. Afterwards the old cardinal, who was disliked by all for his avarice and arbitrary ways, was appointed Commissioner Extraordinary for all the papal possessions as far as the Po, with his residence in Bologna, to restore order in the Legations. But his mission failed completely, and in January 1832 he had to call in the Austrians, scarcely six months after their retirement from the Papal States. This time again the help was sent without delay. Radetzky marched into Bologna with a crushing force. The French ambassador had informed Bernetti that France would occupy Ancona if the Austrians were again called in; and this threat was executed on 21st March in spite of the protest of Rome. Périer explained in the French Chamber of Deputies that this step was taken in order to extort Liberal reforms in the Papal States; but the Austrians were more successful in suppressing the revolt in the Legations than France was in effecting reforms at Rome. Everything returned to the old conditions. The universities had already been closed in 1831; the young men who had taken up arms were excluded from all offices, and many were obliged to live in exile.² In foreign lands the exiled Italians prepared themselves to work in the country of their birth in happier times, but many of them bore an ingrained hatred of the Church and of Christianity. The education of the people greatly declined in the Papal States. Affection for Pope and Church did not suffer thereby. But it angered others besides the exiled friends of Italian freedom to see foreign soldiers in Italy, and the joy was

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XIX, 24f.

² Köberle II, 232f.

universal when the Austrians evacuated Bologna, and when the French (in 1838) left Ancona. It was not long, however, before the see of St Peter again needed the support of bayonets.

If we wish to form a clear conception of the spirit which pervaded the immediate entourage of Gregory XVI., we must read the encyclical *Mirari vos*, which he sent to all patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Catholic Church on the Feast of the Assumption of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, 15th August 1832.¹ It is a continuation of the utterances of Leo XII. and Pius VIII., a link in the chain of declarations of war against the whole of modern society, which reached their most sonorous utterance in the Encyclical and Syllabus of Pius IX. in 1864. Gregory complains in this circular letter that reckless wickedness, shameless science, and licentiousness without bounds, prevail everywhere. Holy things are despised, and the service of God ridiculed. The sacred doctrines are falsified, and all sorts of errors are disseminated with the greatest audacity. St Peter's chair has been rudely shaken, and the bonds of unity become weaker day by day. The Church is surrendered to the hatred of the people. Academies and schools echo horribly with new and unheard-of opinions, which no longer in secret and by roundabout ways undermine the Catholic faith, but wage an open and sacrilegious war against it; for when the young are corrupted by the principles and examples of their teachers, then the disaster to religion is as great and the moral disorder as deep as is possible. And all these tribulations are due especially to the secret societies which are like a sink of all impiety and blasphemy.

In what follows Gregory XVI. maintains that it is impious to speak of a regeneration of the Church; the Pope alone has authority to decide as regards all regulations and decrees. He mentions, with indignation, the many attacks on celibacy which have appeared of late, and the petitions for the abolition of it, which people have dared to send openly to the sovereigns.² But marriage also is dishonoured; the nations, therefore, need to be instructed about the permanence of the matrimonial

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XIX, 126f. In French in Sylvain, 362f.

² With regard to these attacks, see the short sketch in K. Hase: *Kirchengeschichte*, 9th edition, 695.

bond, and about the unlawfulness of divorce. Then follows a condemnation of the view that every one is saved by his own belief, and of the heresy, "or rather the insanity," that follows upon the theory that everybody must enjoy liberty of conscience. History shows that states have perished through liberty of opinion, freedom of speech, and the craze for reform. The liberty of the Press is also a horrible thing; errors are spread in this way, like a curse over all the earth. The apostles burned books, it continues,¹ and, after the example of the Church of the Middle Ages, the fathers at Trent issued their useful decree for the making of an index of the books in which impure doctrine is found. It is also a wholly pernicious assertion that the Church's censure of books is objectionable and unjustifiable; it is, on the contrary, useful in the highest degree.

But not the Church alone suffers from all these calamities. Certain doctrines are taught in writings which are spread amongst the people, by which the fidelity and subjection which the people owe to their sovereigns are shaken, and the torches of rebellion are lit. Holy Scripture commands obedience towards authorities, and the Christians of old, even in times of persecution, were obedient to heathen emperors. But now men have arisen who attack the rights of rulers, and who, under the appearance of liberty, wish to bring the nations under the yoke of thralldom. The depraved and insane doctrines and deeds of the Waldenses, the Beghards, the Wyclifites, and similar children of Belial, had the same aim. These were the filth and the disgrace of mankind, therefore they have often been justly excommunicated by the Roman See. And all those who have become old in fraud, use all their strength, like Luther, in order to be able to boast of having shaken off every restraint.

Finally, Gregory XVI. exhorts the bishops to take a fatherly interest in all those who cultivate the sciences, especially theology and philosophy. But "only proud or rather foolish men can vaunt of wishing to penetrate, by human research, the secrets of the faith, which surpass all knowledge, or of trusting to reason, which by nature is weak and feeble." The encyclical ends, like the encyclical of Pius VIII., with an

¹ Acts xix. 19.

admonition to lift hands and eyes to the Most Holy Virgin Mary, who alone is the vanquisher of all heresies.

The strong condemnation of the liberty of conscience and of the liberty of the Press contained in the encyclical *Mirari vos* had a definite aim. At the close of the year 1831 Gregory XVI. had been visited by three French pilgrims—*pèlerins de Dieu et de la liberté*, as they called themselves. Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Count Montalembert had resorted to the *limina apostolorum* in order to find comfort there from the persecution which they had suffered in France, where the Royalists could not forgive these editors of the Liberal Catholic paper, *L'Avenir*, because they had dared to separate the cause of the Church from the cause of the legitimist monarchy, while the Liberals would not trust their Liberal Catholicism.¹ The French episcopate had condemned their work, and the papal nuncio had publicly expressed his disapproval of their efforts. They wished now to bring their case before the chair of St Peter; but no good thing was in store for them at Rome. The Jesuits, headed by Lamennais' old opponent, Père Rozaven, had stirred up an antipathy there against French Liberal Catholicism, and the enmity of Père Rozaven was a power to be dreaded. He was, according to Dupanloup, the most accomplished theologian the French Church had possessed since the days of Bossuet.

The three pilgrims nevertheless fixed their hopes on the Pope. Leo XII. had in his time shown extraordinary friendliness to Lamennais, and had held out to him the prospect of a cardinal's hat; why should not Gregory XVI. also be friendly? The hope of the pilgrims sank, however, when, from all that they heard, they began to perceive that Gregory XVI. was only a kind-hearted monk who did not know much of the affairs of this world, and who did not understand the condition of the Church; and when they saw also that he was surrounded by ambitious and avaricious, blind and imbecile persons, to whom religion was as much a matter of indifference as it was to the political cabinets of Europe.² When the three pilgrims at last obtained an audience of the Pope, Gregory XVI. evaded

¹ Lamennais: *Affaires de Rome* (Paris 1836) and E. Spuller: *Lamennais* (Paris 1892), 187f.

² Lamennais' letter to the Abbé Gerbet of 28th January 1832, in Spuller, 195.

every allusion to the reason for their journey; he talked to them instead about the art of Michael Angelo, and offered them a pinch of snuff from his own snuff-box of *lapis lazuli*. But their errand was not forgotten. The *Avenir* had ranged itself on the side of the people against the kings. Gregory XVI., on the other hand, felt himself to be one with the other crowned heads of Europe, and the judgment of Rome in the matter of Liberal Catholicism was contained in the encyclical *Mirari vos*.

On the day after its issue Cardinal Pacca wrote a letter to Lamennais, in which he told him "confidentially" that the new encyclical condemned Liberal Catholicism, but, out of forbearance, without mentioning the names of the leaders of the party or of their publications. In the first place, writes the cardinal, it has grieved His Holiness that the editors of *L'Avenir* have discussed before the eyes of the public delicate questions which ought to be exclusively decided by the rulers of the Church or by its head. Further, the Pope must disapprove of the doctrines of political and civil liberty, which are propounded in *L'Avenir*. These can only tend to stir up a spirit of rebellion amongst subjects against their sovereigns, and they are in open conflict with the principles of the Gospel and of the Church; for the Church has always in equal degree preached obedience to the people and justice to princes. Rome finds, moreover, that the teaching of *L'Avenir* concerning liberty of worship and liberty of the Press is against the principles and practice of the Church, and even if prudence under certain circumstances should demand that such things must be tolerated "as a lesser evil" (*comme un moindre mal*), it has astonished and grieved His Holiness to see such doctrine represented as a good thing in itself or as desirable. Finally, it has caused the Pope the greatest sorrow that the editors, even after appealing to Rome, have dared to speak of common action on the part of those "who still hope and mean to labour for the liberty of the world."¹

This letter, which forms an instructive commentary upon different parts of the papal encyclical, reached Lamennais at a festive moment.² On 30th August he and his two companions were guests at a dinner given in honour of the three pilgrims at Munich; "for," as Lamennais says, "amongst the Bavarian

¹ *Affaires de Rome*, 129f.

² *Ibid.*, 125. Spuller, 205.

clergy there prevailed at that time a certain Protestant spirit, which would undoubtedly have led to a breach with Rome, if ideas had not already gone far beyond mere Protestantism." Men like Joseph Görres, Schelling, and Döllinger were present, and they had just drunk a toast to the connexion between the Catholics of France and Germany, when Lamennais was called out, because a messenger from the papal nuncio at Munich wished to speak with him. The messenger brought the encyclical and Cardinal Pacca's letter. Lamennais immediately read the cardinal's letter, and when he returned to the festive table, he said: "I have just received a papal encyclical against us; we must submit without hesitation."

Lamennais' submission to the severe encyclical did not last long. A few months after subscribing to a formula which Quélen, Archbishop of Paris, in concert with Rome had set before him,¹ he published a new book, *Paroles d'un croyant*, in which he protested against the papal condemnation of the work of liberty which marked the age. The answer of Rome was a new encyclical, *Singulari vos*,² which not only condemned the revolutionary writing of the former apologist of Ultramontanism, but also pronounced anathema upon the philosophical system which twenty-seven years before had opened all doors and all hearts at Rome for its author. In the same year a papal brief was also issued to the Bishop of Strassburg, in which this prelate was praised, because he had uplifted his pastoral staff against Louis Bautain, a priest and professor at Strassburg, whose utterances on the subject of reason and faith seemed to Rome to be highly dangerous.³ In 1840 the Abbé Bautain submitted and subscribed to six propositions, which were put before him by his bishop.⁴ In 1835 the writings and disciples of the late philosopher of Bonn, Georg Hermes, were also condemned by a papal brief,⁵ after the Hermesian philosophy had been examined by the Rector of the Propaganda, afterwards Cardinal Reisach, and by the Jesuit Perrone. It was the signal for a prolonged philosophical strife, which had considerable influence

¹ Reusch: *Index* II, 1097.

² Printed in *Affaires de Rome*, 378f.

³ Rheinwald in *Acta hist.-eccles. seculi XIX* for 1835, 337.

⁴ Denzinger: *Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum* (Würzburg 1894), 352.

⁵ Rheinwald for 1835, 1f., and 1836, 2f.

upon the position of the Roman Church in Germany. The detailed account of Lamennais' apostasy and the remonstrances of the Hermesians against the dictatorial language of the Pope must be deferred until we describe the inner life of the Church of Rome. They are only mentioned here in passing, in order to show how the Papacy, more and more dominated by the Jesuits, issued one fulmination after another against the Roman Catholic philosophy which desired to free itself from the scholastic yoke. In 1840 an attack was opened by the Jesuits upon the noble Italian priest, Antonio Rosmini-Serbatì, who was accused of sharing the errors of Bajus, Cornelius Jansen, Quesnel, and even Luther and Calvin.¹ Gregory XVI. had the matter examined, and enjoined both parties to keep silence; but afterwards, under Pius IX., Rosmini, as we shall see, came into more serious conflict with the congregation of the Index.

The encyclical *Mirari vos*, which condemned Lamennais and Liberal Catholicism, was also meant to be a condemnation of the free constitution which Belgium had just then adopted; for the Belgian constitution guaranteed to all citizens that liberty of conscience which the encyclical called *deliramentum*, and that liberty of the Press about which Gregory XVI. had used language not less strong. The Liberal Catholics in Belgium took the papal anathema much to heart. Some of their leaders at once retired from public life; others attempted by sophistical distinctions and ambiguities to soften the papal condemnation.² But the non-Catholic Belgians lost their faith in their Catholic brethren's love of liberty, and the chief effect of the encyclical as regards Belgium was that a Liberal party was formed, which has since taken up an attitude of irreconcilable antagonism to the Ultramontane party.

Bernetti was in agreement with the Pope in his trenchant utterances against the Liberal cravings of the age, but otherwise the relations between the Pope and his secretary were not very cordial. In order to obtain a quicker despatch of business, Gregory XVI. had divided the Secretaryship of State, so that Bernetti retained the direction of foreign affairs, the military and

¹ Reusch: *Index* II, 1139f. F. X. Kraus: *Antonio Rosmini* in the *Deutsche Rundschau* (1888), vol. lv. 49f.

² E. de Laveleye: *Die clericale Partei in Belgien* (Bonn 1875), 11f. Cp. also Döllinger: *Das Papstthum*, 275f.

the police, whilst Cardinal Gamberini took over the management of home affairs.¹ Bernetti as a politician endeavoured as far as possible to hold the balance between France and Austria. He had, of course, officially to protest against the French occupation of Ancona, but it was not disagreeable to him that the oppressive influence of Austria was thereby diminished.

Metternich was much dissatisfied with the way in which things were going at Rome. On 19th May 1832 he complained to Count Lützow that the ruling party in Rome hindered all good government, and seized the slightest opportunity of postponing all useful measures.² It annoyed him greatly that the English envoy, shortly after the occupation of Ancona, retired from the council of the Great Powers, because in the view of the English government much greater concessions on the part of the Pope ought to be made, if tranquillity were to be restored in the Papal States. Gregory XVI. sought in vain to soften the mighty chancellor by presenting him with an altar of marble and porphyry with the relics of a little saint of five years old belonging to the age of the martyrs. With this gift came also, as Princess Metternich wrote in her diary,³ "a touching letter and a very handsome indulgence fastened to the altar." The Prince, according to his wife's statement, was charmed with the altar and the relics, but not less displeased with Bernetti than before. And he became still more angry when the papal Secretary of State wounded him personally. Bernetti, who was much irritated by the growing intractability of Austria, allowed himself one day to give vent to his displeasure in a sarcastic little note to the French ambassador, Count Latour-Maubourg. In order to show his king what oppression Austria was exercising upon the see of St Peter, the ambassador sent Bernetti's biting sarcasms to Paris, and Louis Philippe sent them on to Vienna, "to give Austria a proof of his sincerity." Metternich was furious, and told Gregory XVI. that he would not get rid of the Austrian troops until he changed his Secretary of State.⁴

One morning in 1836, when Bernetti was suffering from an attack of his old enemy, the gout, the Pope came to visit

¹ Farini I, 78.

² Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* V, 332.

³ *Op. cit.*, V, 420.

⁴ Maynard: *J. Crétineau-Joly*, 344, from Gregory XVI.'s own account to Crétineau-Joly.

him. The invalided Secretary of State felt much flattered at the unexpected honour, but he was not a little astonished when Gregory XVI., in the course of conversation, advised him to pay regard to his health, and to apply for permission to resign. "Impossible!" exclaimed Bernetti. "How is that, my Lord Cardinal?" the Pope asked somewhat uneasily. "Impossible? What do you mean?" He soon felt easy again, when Bernetti, with a smile, said that the gout prevented him at the moment from writing. Later in the same day Gregory XVI., who wished the matter settled as quickly as possible, sent his major-domo to Bernetti to fetch the application for his discharge; but the messenger returned without it, and related that the Secretary of State had entertained him with a long account of all the services which he had rendered to the Holy See. Gregory's patience was then exhausted, and on the next morning he informed Bernetti that his resignation of the Secretaryship of State had been accepted, and that Lambruschini was appointed as his successor.¹

We became acquainted with Cardinal Lambruschini as nuncio at Paris, before the Revolution of July. He was born at Genoa, and had formerly been the General of the Barnabites and archbishop in his native town. He was a learned man of strict morals. His friends praised him for his trustworthiness and even temper;² his opponents blamed him for love of power and hierarchical proclivities.³ As Cardinal Gamberini was both too independent and too little discreet for his office,⁴ he was succeeded by Mattei, an insignificant cardinal who, according to Farini, had no training in anything but dissimulation and servility. Lambruschini quickly made himself feared, but not loved, and Gregory XVI. himself came little by little under his tyranny. In foreign affairs Lambruschini as a rule followed Austria; in home affairs the policy of Leo XII. was the State Secretary's ideal. But both at home and abroad he fulfilled the bidding of the Jesuits. During his government

¹ Silvagni III, 469. Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 414f.

² A. von Reumont: *Aus König Friedrich Wilhelms IV. gesunden und kranken Tagen* (Leipzig 1885), 123, after Count Brühl.

³ Farini I, 78f., and Silvagni III, 470f.

⁴ His indiscretion towards the young Pasolini may be seen in G. Pasolini: *Memorie* (Torino 1887), 33.

the cardinals repaired at eventide to the house of the professed Jesuits, to receive the necessary instructions. The former nuncio at Paris knew all the intrigues of the European Courts, and was acquainted with all the secret strings of politics. As a diplomatist he was in many ways a disciple of Consalvi, but of a more ecclesiastical bias, and less noble than his master. It has been said that legitimacy was his natural religion; that France was to him the Carthage to be destroyed, and Italy a rebellious atheistic country which must again be brought to obedience by discipline, force, and chastisements.¹ He soon became a powerful minister who ruled everything according to his own ideas. Gregory XVI. soon came not to care to contradict him, and the foreign powers acquiesced in his arbitrary ways, because they were sure of his legitimist principles.

And what had not the inhabitants of the Papal States to endure? The system of espionage of the days of Leo XII. was reintroduced, though on a more extensive scale. In 1841 the inquisitor at Pesaro issued an edict which threatened various ecclesiastical punishments — amongst others, excommunication for any one who omitted to report the names of persons who ate meat on fast days. It was thus made the duty of every maid-servant to come forward as the accuser of her master and mistress, if they transgressed the rules of fasting.² During the administration of Lambruschini it was a crime to speak of reforms and improvements. The moderate Liberalism which desired that the Papacy should accommodate itself to modern times, was in his eyes as dangerous as the revolutionary ideas of Mazzini; and the new Secretary of State regarded lighting by gas, railways, and scientific congresses with as much suspicion as Liberalism. The papal universities received a letter informing them that the Holy See had good and sufficient reasons for not merely forbidding all subjects of the Pope to take part in scientific congresses; it was even forbidden that any one should enter into correspondence with them. Cardinal Mastai, afterwards Pius IX., then Bishop of Imola, heard of these prohibitions with dislike. "As far as I know," he said with a slight irony to a nobleman

¹ Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 417.

² Döllinger: *Kirche und Staat*, 576f.

from Ravenna, "theology does not stand in opposition to advance in science, art, and industry."¹ But Lambruschini was convinced that all congresses, even if they professed to treat only of science, literature, or agriculture, were pretexts for the revolutionary propaganda; and the day came when the Cardinal of Imola, as the successor of Gregory XVI., understood better Lambruschini's anxieties lest the meetings of learned men should become conspiracies against the Papacy and the Pope's Infallibility.

Gregory XVI. was a friend of all the monastic orders, and he set great value upon religious spectacles, especially upon exhibitions of relics and canonisations. In 1839 many of the Italian bishops met at Rome to assist at the canonisation of five saints; one of these was Alfonso de' Liguori, who on 26th May 1839 finally obtained the honour that had long been contemplated for him.² St Peter's church was on that day splendidly illuminated; various pictures made known to the assembled crowds how great a claim the new saints, and above all St Alfonso, had to the saintly crown, and Gregory XVI. delivered a panegyric upon the five "heroes," who had now won a place on the altars of the Roman Church.

A couple of years afterwards, a miracle was supposed to have taken place in Rome, which gave a new impulse to the belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Madonna. A French lady of the order of St Vincent de Paul believed that she had had a revelation to the effect that medals ought to be struck in honour of the Immaculate Conception, and Gregory XVI. immediately promised those who should wear such medals a plenary indulgence. A young French Jew, Alphonse de Ratisbonne, had been persuaded by a Roman Catholic friend, Baron de Bassière, to wear such a medal on his breast; and while he knelt before the altar of St Michael in the church of S. Andrea delle Fratte in the Via Capo le Case, on 20th January 1842, he thought that he saw the Madonna. After this apparition he wished to be baptized, and the whole of Rome talked of the young Jew's sudden conversion. Gregory XVI. had the case examined, and on 3rd June 1842 he issued a decree, which announced to Catholic Christendom

¹ E. Venosta: *Papa Pio IX. Ricordi storici e biografici* (Milano 1878), 78.

² Bull of Canonisation in Capecelatro: *S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori* II, 582f.

that the Blessed Virgin had by means of a miracle converted a young Jew.¹ When a rich lady placed her fortune at Ratisbonne's disposal, he instituted the order of *Notre Dame de Sion*, which was to work for the conversion of Jewish women. The inscription on a votive tablet in S. Andrea delle Fratte still relates the story of the young Frenchman, who knelt as a Jew before the Madonna but rose up a Christian, and every 20th of January there is a great festival in the church in memory of the Madonna's manifestation.

In 1834 Gregory XVI., at the instigation of the Archbishop of Seville, had already allowed the Spaniards on the day of the Conception of Mary (8th December) to say in the preface at Mass: *Et te in conceptione immaculata*, and afterwards the churches of other countries obtained the same permission. After the supposed miracle in S. Andrea delle Fratte the Dominicans were permitted, on the petition of their general Angelo Ancarani, to celebrate the festival of the Immaculate Conception by a solemn octave, and to add the word *immaculata* in the preface. In the litanies at Loreto they prayed already to the Madonna as *regina sine labe originali concepta*, and in the monastery of the S. Apostoli an *Accademia della Concezione Immacolata* was established which is still in full activity. Many appeals also were made to Gregory XVI. to proclaim the dogma of the Madonna's immaculate conception, but he hesitated to decide the old dispute by a dictum of the Pope. Not that he doubted of his own infallibility. A contemporary diplomatist has related that Gregory XVI. rejoiced in a very naïve manner over his exalted position, amongst other things because he believed that in virtue of it he was raised above all possibility of error. When Capaccini had for a long time vainly taken much pains to inculcate into Gregory XVI. sounder financial principles, the Pope used to say, that he was himself the successor of St Peter, and as such he could not be in the wrong, but knew everything better than others did.²

In the political sphere he was no more willing to make concessions than Leo XII. and Pius VIII. had been. A serious

¹ Sylvain, 259f. Ratisbonne has himself described his conversion in a work called *Notizia sulla sua conversione* (Venice 1842).

² Döllinger: *Das Papstthum*, 234f. ; following: *Politische Briefe und Charakteristiken* (Berlin 1849), 248.

conflict arose with the Prussian government regarding the old controversial question of mixed marriages, and the tension between the Church and the Prussian State became so great, that first Archbishop Droste zu Vischering of Cologne, and afterwards Archbishop Dunin of Gnesen-Posen, had to undergo confinement in a Prussian state prison. When the Archbishop of Cologne was imprisoned (20th November 1837) Gregory XVI. delivered a speech to the cardinals, in which he deplored that the liberty of the Church had been outraged, the episcopal dignity put to scorn, and the rights of the Holy See trodden underfoot.¹ There was great exasperation in Germany, especially on the Rhine, and Joseph Görres described Archbishop Droste as a new Athanasius. As soon, however, as the romantic Frederic William IV. mounted the throne in 1840, the strife with the Church was ended to the advantage of Rome, and Lambruschini could boast of an important victory over a great Protestant power.

This victory did not make Rome more kindly disposed towards Protestantism. On 8th May 1844 Gregory XVI. issued a violent encyclical (*Inter præcipuas*), which attacked the work of the Bible Societies and the Evangelical Alliance, which had recently been formed by Protestants mainly belonging to England and Scotland. These organisations, according to the Pope, under the guise of working for religious liberty, aimed at instilling into the Italians, and especially into the Romans, religious indifference.² The vehement language of this encyclical shows how bitter the feeling at Rome was against the disciples of Luther and Calvin, and in Germany Ultramontanism was now so confident of victory, that Arnoldi, Bishop of Trier, ventured to exhibit the chief relic of his cathedral, the seamless coat of Christ. More than a million pilgrims flocked to Trier, but from the Laura hut in Silesia, a deposed Roman Catholic curate, Johannes Ronge, published a letter against Bishop Arnoldi, as a new Tetzel. There were several of Luther's words, but there was none of his spirit in Ronge's letter, and the German Catholics, who in the period which followed left the Roman

¹ The speech is in Hase: *Die beiden Erzbischöfe* in his *Gesammelte Werke* X, 144f.

² The encyclical in *Lettres apostoliques de Pie IX., Grégoire XVI., Pie VII.* (Paris 1894), 222f.

Church under his guidance, broke more and more away from fundamental Christian principles.

In what degree mediæval superstition still held sway in Rome itself was seen during the cholera epidemic.¹ It must be stated, to the honour of Gregory XVI., that he had adopted several useful measures before the plague reached his capital; thus he had instituted the new cemetery on the Campo Verano, by the church of San Lorenzo. But when the sickness broke out the year following in Rome, the inhabitants of Rome might have believed themselves transported back to the days of Gregory the Great by the procession which they witnessed on 6th August. Just as after the plague in 590, the picture of the Madonna from the chapel of the Borghese in Santa Maria Maggiore, which, according to the legend, was painted by St Luke, was carried in solemn procession through the town. The aged Pope walked himself in front, with a lighted taper in his hand; after him thirty men carried a magnificent altar, upon which was set the sacred picture, now nearly quite effaced, and behind the altar came a numberless crowd of men and women. The procession lasted four hours, and at last the miracle-working picture was placed on the high altar—in the *Gesù* church. The crowd followed into this church, which was filled to overflowing for more than a week, because as many as possible wished to be secured against the infectious disease by proximity to the work of St Luke. Gregory XVI. said Mass before the sacred picture, and after it he cried aloud: “O Romans, ye are in truth the people of Mary!” On 15th August—Assumption Day—he blessed the *urbs et orbis* from the Loggia of the Quirinal, and after that the sacred painting was carried back to Santa Maria Maggiore in a new procession. All the great relics of Rome were also exhibited, with promises of bountiful indulgences; and when the plague ceased, the Pope crowned with his own hand the picture of the Madonna in Santa Maria Maggiore with a splendid diadem. In these processions, which attracted the crowds to the church of the Jesuits, Loyola’s disciples played a chief part, and, during the time of the plague, the Society of Jesus gained an increased influence over the inhabitants of Rome.²

¹ Sylvain 325f., after a correspondence in the *Univers* of 15th August 1837, and Silvagni III, 477.

² J. Alberdingk Thijm: *Levensschets van P. Roothaan*, 125f.

In the year following the cholera epidemic, the Austrians finally evacuated the Legations, and at the same time the French retired from Ancona. During the period immediately following there seemed to be tranquillity everywhere in the Pope's dominions, but the conspirators continued secretly their undermining work, in the hope of better times for the realisation of their schemes. Gregory XVI., who was deceived by the apparently quiet surface, thought that it would strengthen his authority and influence if he undertook a tour through some of the provinces. Lambruschini was for a long time opposed to the Pope's wish, partly because there was a sad want of money in the papal treasury, partly because the astute secretary feared lest the Pope while on the spot in various places, should awaken hopes which afterwards he would be obliged to disappoint. But Gregory XVI. was resolved to set out. On 31st August 1841 he left Rome, in order to reach Loreto by way of Terni, Spoleto, Foligno, and Tolentino.¹ Cardinal Mattei was always a day's journey in front of his master, in order to prepare everything for a festal reception, and Gregory XVI. was greeted with great reverence, both by the people and by the monks. At Tolentino he said Mass over the relics of St Nicholas; at Loreto he lingered in devotion in the holy House.² Thence he journeyed to Ancona and Fabriano, where he prayed by the relics of St Romuald, and so on by Assisi, Orvieto, and Viterbo, to the Dominicans at Quercia. On 6th October he was again in Rome. During his absence Lambruschini had administered the Papal States, and he soon discovered that his doubts with regard to the utility of the journey were fully justified. Gregory XVI. had not dared to visit the most difficult regions in the north, and the friends of the Revolution were anything but edified by seeing the aged Pope hasten from relic to relic. The journey cost two million francs, and the popularity which Gregory XVI. won by it was of doubtful value. He himself related with a certain humour that some villagers, in the broiling heat of noonday, had dragged his carriage up to their town, which lay upon a hill. Full of

¹ Sylvain, 317f.

² To learn the stories that are still related about this house and its removals, read J. B. Vuillaume: *La sainte maison de Lorette* (Rome 1884), issued from the office of the *Moniteur de Rome*, the official papal paper.

pity he exclaimed : "*Povera gente*," but the *Gonfaloniere* said to comfort him : "Do not be troubled, Holy Father ; they have been well paid for it."¹

As Pope, Gregory XVI. preserved his old love for art and science.² He established two museums at the Vatican, one for Egyptian, and another for Etruscan antiquities ; at the Lateran he laid the foundations of the Christian museum, and in 1840 he was able to dedicate a part of St Paul's church without the walls, which had been rebuilt in marble splendour. Painters like Camuccini, Podesti, Minardi, Agricola, Silvagni, and Overbeck, and sculptors like Fabris, Tadolini, and Tenerani, were often received in audience by him, and he followed their labours with sympathy. Thorvaldsen also continued his artistic career in Rome under him, and a Danish painter, Albert K  chler, became so greatly enamoured of the Eternal City and its religious life, that he forgot his native land of Denmark. He came to Rome in 1831, an artist of twenty-eight years of age, and of lively disposition ; but by degrees he was engrossed by religious seriousness, so that he abandoned the merry *genre* paintings, in which he had employed his talents, for reredoses and religious paintings. In 1844 he was received into the Roman Church ; in 1851 he became a Franciscan friar, and in the monastery of Bonaventura, under its beautiful palms, he worked industriously with his pious brush, until he was laid to rest on a day in February 1886, in the cemetery at Sta. Maria dell' Anima.

In Rome there were also learned men of European reputation. The Bergamese Angelo Mai, a disciple of the Jesuits, ruled over the treasures of the Vatican library, and discovered and edited many writings of classical antiquity. In 1838 Gregory XVI. presented him and one of the greatest linguists of modern times, Giuseppe Mezzofanti of Bologna, with the red hat. Mezzofanti could speak many languages, and could read still more ; and his humility impressed everybody. As Cardinal of St Onofrio, he was as unpretending as when he earned bread for himself and for his relatives by badly-paid lessons. But none of the learned men of Rome was so closely allied to Gregory XVI. as the former barber's apprentice, Gaetano Moroni, who, by his contemporaries and in after years, has been

¹ Maynard : *Cr  tineau-Joly*, 31f.

² Silvagni III, 495f.

placed by the side of Muratori and of Tiraboschi. Moroni commenced in 1840 the edition of his great *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica da S. Pietro sino ai nostri tempi*, which finally filled 120 volumes, of nearly 500 pages each. It contains a mass of information about details of church history, which is otherwise difficult of access. The Pope's favour opened all libraries and archives for Moroni, and obtained for him useful help from all contemporary Roman Catholic men of learning. Throughout Moroni's *Dizionario* is discerned the revived Ultramontanism and its mediæval sympathies, as, for instance, when it speaks of *la salutare e benigna istituzione del benemerito tribunale dell' Inquisizione*.¹

Malicious tongues were busy—as it seems, without cause²—in interpreting the kindness of Gregory XVI. to Gaetano and his wife in a manner very derogatory to the Pope's morality, and on the death of Gregory the many satires, which, as usual, appeared, contained sarcastic references to the intimacy between the dead Pope and "Gaetanino." But as long as Gregory XVI. was alive, all Romans and travellers to Rome courted the help of the powerful favourite, and Moroni was in many ways useful to his master. Such men as Cesare Cantù, Coppi, and Padre Marchi had also the satisfaction of enjoying the Pope's favour, and when Silvio Pellico got free from his Austrian prison he was received at Rome with great kindness.³

Gregory XVI., who was naturally of a jovial disposition, needed also lighter entertainment than intercourse with learned men. Now and again he gathered a few cardinals and prelates in small reunions, at which humour and jests had free play, and the priestly gossips were then treated to *bon-bons*, which the sweet-toothed Pope had ordered from Paris. Sometimes he had novels read to him, and even such a profane author as Paul de Kock is said to have enjoyed the honour of having his works read aloud to the aged successor of St Peter.⁴

In the course of time Cardinal Lambruschini obtained more and more firm hold of the political wires which were centred in Rome, and even in home politics his opinion and that of the Jesuits became the ruling opinion. Gregory XVI. himself

¹ *Dizionario* XXXIV, 40

² *Nuova Antologia* (1883) XLII, 279f.

³ Silvagni III, 496.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 497.

seems sometimes to have felt that reforms were needed in the government of the Papal States; but the word "reform" was a horror to Lambruschini, and the power of old customs and the want of men to carry out anything new made it impossible for Gregory XVI. to think of reforming in earnest. He relieved himself by occasionally giving vent to his uneasy feelings, as when in 1843 he spoke to Bernardi the following remarkable words: "The civil government of the Roman States needs considerable reform. I was too old when they elected me Pope; I did not expect to live long, and I lacked courage to be a reformer, for he who begins reforms must also carry them out. Now I have only a few years, or, perhaps, a few days, to live. But after me they will choose a young Pope, and it will fall to his lot to do the deeds without which it is impossible for us to continue to exist."¹

Under the government of Gregory XVI. and Lambruschini the Papacy continued to be the old Rome, answering *Non possumus* to all demands. But during the Papacy of Gregory XVI. a national movement grew and ripened, the motto of which was: "Unity and Independence." It was "the young Italy" (*la giovine Italia*).

In the year 1830 a young Genoese of the age of twenty-two, by name Giuseppe Mazzini, lay in prison at Savona; shortly after the July days he had been imprisoned as a member of a *Carbonaro* Lodge at Genoa.² None of his friends were allowed to visit him in the prison, but his mother had permission to send him food. She understood her son, and knew that he was burning with desire to know whether the July Revolution, which both of them had greeted with enthusiasm, had brought liberty or a fresh thralldom. One day she sent him with the food a slip of paper on which was written: *Polonia insurrexit*. Mazzini had to wait a long time for the explanation of these words; he first obtained it when he was allowed to speak with his mother for three hours before he was sent over the Italian frontier.

In the long nights and days in prison he had conceived the

¹ Quoted in Döllinger: *Kirche und Kirchen*, 565, after the *Rivista contemporanea* for February 1860, 97. Döllinger says that he personally heard the same from "a famous Roman scholar."

² Mazzini: *Scritti editi e inediti* (Milano 1861) I, 23f.

plan for a new political and national conspiracy. The *Carbonaria* seemed to him like a thing dead, and instead of wasting time and energy in trying to infuse new life into it, he wished to form another secret society, the aim of which was the unity and independence of Italy.¹ When he reached Marseilles a free man, he sent Charles Albert of Savoy, who had recently ascended the throne of Sardinia, an open letter, which was smuggled into Italy and printed there. It exhorted the new king to liberate the country from the barbarians, and set before him the choice between being the first man in Italy or the last of the Italian tyrants.² Afterwards he framed more precisely the rules of the new "brotherhood,"³ which had a certain right to the name of "young Italy," since it only admitted members under forty years of age. Any one who was made a member of the brotherhood had to swear, in the name of God, of Italy, and of all the martyrs for the Italian cause, to work with all his might for the formation of a united, independent, free, and republican Italy. The new conspiracy was to gather all exiled Italians into a society which might work in foreign countries for the salvation of their own, and since the Papal States sent out a particularly large number of fugitives, these states furnished many members to the new society, who burned with the desire to plant the banner of liberty at the foot of St Peter's chair. When the members of "young Italy" were permitted to return home, they secretly carried on an active propaganda, and they made many proselytes, especially in Romagna.

As a rule, however, it was mostly amongst the student class⁴ that "young Italy" gained its adherents. The great bulk of the people and the older generation found it difficult to believe in the possibility of realising the idea of unity.⁵ The Roman empire in its time had been unable to extinguish the traces of the old feuds between the tribes of the peninsula, and the Papacy of the Middle Ages had not been successful in getting rid of the

¹ Mazzini I, 38f. Cp. Farini I, 87f. Massimo d'Azeglio: *I miei ricordi* gives the criticism of the Neo-Guelphism on the movement.

² The letter in Mazzini I, 55-81.

³ This *Istruzione generale per gli affratellati nella Giovine Italia* is printed in Mazzini I, 107f. Cp. also *I collaboratori della Giovine Italia ai loro concittadini* (1832). *Ibid.*, p. 338f.

⁴ Döllinger, 568.

⁵ Gervinus: *Geschichte des 19ten Jahrhunderts* IV, 243f.

intestine troubles which constantly induced foreigners to interfere in the disputes of that beautiful country. There was still plenty of jealousy between the inhabitants of the peninsula. The industrious Florentine looked down with contempt on the lazy and poor, but proud, Roman, and the Roman made merry over the pedantry and parsimony of the Tuscan. The Venetian scorned the Lombards, who in his eyes were Bœotians; the Genoese was ever ready to criticise the Piedmontese; and all the rest of the Italians felt themselves to be high above the careless, dirty, and untrustworthy Neapolitans. How, then, was it possible to gather all these elements into one nation, and to change Italy from a geographical expression into a political reality—a free republic? When Mazzini expounded his ideas in Paris, he soon perceived that the exiled Italians there, for the most part Lombards, who were under the influence of Cousin, Guizot, and Villemain, had not advanced further than to wish for their country a federal union like the Swiss;¹ and when the Italian question was under debate in the French Chamber of Deputies, Thiers said: "Napoleon also dreamt of an Italy as he dreamt of a Poland, but unhappily he was unable to realise either the one or the other. It is impossible to unite such different people as Neapolitans, Romans, Bolognese, and North Italians under one and the same government."²

But there were two poets who had grasped the idea of Italian unity. In Vincenzo Monti it appeared by glimpses, as when he sang:

"Una deh sia la patria, e ne' perigli
Uno il senno, l'ardir, l'alme, le vite!"

A more noble and a greater poetical genius, Alessandro Manzoni, was from an early period a decided Unionist. When he and Mazzini met in 1860, they rejoiced that for a long time they had both been true friends of Italian unity, though the only ones (*i soli veri unitarii d'Italia*).³ To the astonishment of Montalembert Manzoni, during a conversation at Brussels in 1836, declared that the unity of Italy under a prince of the house of Savoy was his ideal. Montalembert asked if Manzoni, as a good Catholic, would not make an exception as regards

¹ Mazzini I, 44.

² Köberle II, 354f.

³ A. de Gubernatis: *Alessandro Manzoni* (Firenze 1879), p. 173.

the papal dominions, in order that St Peter's successor might continue to be *il Papa-Re*. But Manzoni answered cheerfully: "When I say that I wish for the unity of Italy under a sovereign, who is not the Pope, it seems to me that I have already answered your question."¹ But Italian unity had to face many difficulties, and Thiers in the Chamber of Deputies pointed to one of the greatest, when he said. "Where is a capital to be found?" The idea of unity could not be fully realised, so long as the courage was lacking to count St Peter's successor amongst those Italian princes, who ought to sacrifice all their temporal power to the house of Savoy.

In the beginning of the forties a strong national awakening did indeed pass over the Italian peninsula. The anticlerical and republican views of Mazzini came into contact with a federalism, which was friendly disposed towards the Roman Church and the Papacy, and which for a time had many adherents both in and out of Italy. The *Carbonaria* rested on Voltairianism or upon religious indifference, and "young Italy," which always had the name of God and the people on its lips,² did not share the faith of the Roman Church.³ But by the side of the *Carbonaria* and the *Giovine Italia*, there appeared also in the forties a Neo-Guelphism, which would not break in any way with Roman Catholic dogmas, and which could not ally itself with a liberalism and a republicanism which scorned the chair of St Peter. In 1843 the poet Giovanni Battista Niccolini, after a long silence, wrote a political and national tragedy called *Arnoldo da Brescia*, in which the poetical spectre of the old hero of liberty was brought to life in order to rouse national feeling and the longing after liberty in a generation which seemed so dull that, as Giuseppe Giusti said of the Tuscans: "Its yawning was its daily song." In spite of this tragedy's violation of all the laws of the Italian drama, and in spite of its many long and dry declamations, it made a strong impression in wide circles. Niccolini, as regards religion, belonged to the negative school, and he expected nothing of the Roman Church, which had degenerated into outward show and worldliness. His drama therefore created dislike amongst the adherents of

¹ A. de Gubernatis, 180.

² *Dio e il Popolo* is the motto of Mazzini's books.

³ Farini I, 87f.

the Papacy, and it came to a bitter personal conflict between him and his old friend Gino Capponi, who, in saying farewell, gave the passionate poet his hand with these words: "You may continue to be a Ghibelline—I continue to be a Guelph; but let us be friends." Niccolini refused Capponi's hand, and there ensued a breach between them which lasted for a long season.¹ At the same time a breach took place between young Italy and the Neo-Guelphs, whose foremost leaders were Gioberti and Balbo.

In the same year as Mazzini, the theologian Vincenzo Gioberti also left Piedmont as a political refugee. In 1843 he published at Brussels, where many of the exiled Italians met, a pamphlet called, *Del primato morale e civile degli Italiani*; it was dedicated to Silvio Pellico, who had suffered for his love of freedom and his patriotism. The Abate Gioberti's book made a great stir in Italy. The high-spirited priest was far from considering the Pope to be the misfortune of Italy, as did Niccolini and Mazzini. On the contrary, he thought that Italy was the most splendid country in the world, *because* it contained the Pope, and *because* the religious capital of the orthodox world was situated there. *With* the Pope Italy could do anything, without him nothing. The Pope, according to Gioberti, ought to be the political and religious head of Italy; under the presidency of the Pope there ought to be formed an Italian confederacy, and the national unity should be sanctified by unity of faith. The national renovation should rely both on the piety of Rome and on the Piedmontese soldiery. Gioberti's pamphlet reminds us of Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme*, and it gave the impulse to an agitation for a national Italian Christianity which was wanting in inward truth in just as great a degree as the Christianity of the Romantic school.

By the side of the Abate Gioberti, the religious seer who cast the glamour of poetry over stern reality, stood Count Cesare Balbo as a practical patriot, who pointed out the work that must needs be done before the great day of liberty could dawn. While Gioberti wrote his books in foreign countries, Balbo issued his exhortations from Turin. In *Delle speranze d'Italia* (1843) he called upon his compatriots to practise all

¹ A. von Reumont: *Gino Capponi*, 229.

domestic virtues and bodily exercises, and to get rid of moral laxity. He did not believe in the possibility of forming one Italian kingdom; he was a thorough federalist, and wished only for a league of states, whose sword was Sardinia, whose heart was Rome. The aim of all Italians ought to be the expulsion of the Austrians; and the royal house of Savoy, the oldest of all the princely houses of Italy, should lead towards the goal; but Rome must join, in order to bestow upon the heroic achievement the blessing of the Church. The Roman Catholic religion, according to Balbo, was not antagonistic to honest schemes for liberty; on the contrary, it would bless and sanctify them. "Formerly," says Farini, "only very few could put their trust in conspiracies, and those who conspired did so rather in despair and from old custom, than in hope and of free will. The adepts of young Italy followed in the ways their leaders had pointed out; but, if I may say so, a political conscience was wanting, and a belief in which an educated mind and a true heart might find rest."¹ It was this that Vincenzo Gioberti and Cesare Balbo gave to their compatriots. And the immediate effect of their writings was very great. A man must, says D'Haussonville, have lived in Italy from 1840 to 1846 to form any notion of the wonderful influence which the writings of Gioberti and Balbo had. D'Haussonville ascribes this effect to the inward truth in these books, and to the fact that both Gioberti and Balbo advised proceeding with moderation, not with violence—to the circumstance also, that instead of preaching hatred, they exhorted the princes to trust their subjects, and subjects to show affection for the ancient dynasties. But what especially gave these men influence over their compatriots was, according to D'Haussonville, their reverence for the ancient faith, which most of the Italians, in spite of their love of liberty, would not abandon.²

But Lambruschini had no more sympathy for the Neo-Guelphs than for young Italy, and just when the new Guelphism appeared, a strong tension arose between the Papacy and France, which warned the Jesuit politicians still more to be on their guard against the Italian patriots.

¹ *Lo stato Romano* I, 89f.

² *Histoire de la politique extérieure du gouvernement français 1830-48* (Paris 1850) II, 192.

The relations between Rome and France had been good for many years; Gregory XVI. seemed inclined to occupy the same neutral position towards the internal politics of France as Pius VIII. had done.¹ Even as late as 1837 he said to Montalembert that he disapproved of the interference of the French episcopate in political differences. "The Church," he is reported to have said to this champion of Liberal Catholicism, "is a friend of all governments, provided they do not trample upon liberty. I am very well satisfied with Louis Philippe; I wish that all the sovereigns of Europe were like him."² By and by, however, there occurred more than one hitch between Rome and France. When the Duke of Bordeaux at the end of 1839 wished to visit Italy, Count de Latour-Maubourg was charged with the task of persuading Gregory XVI. to close the gates of the Vatican to the legitimist prince. The Pope was not willing to comply with the wishes of Louis Philippe on this point; but as the legitimist emigrants at Rome, on the Duke's arrival, indulged in various demonstrations by way of challenge, he allowed a month to pass before he received the Duke. As a compensation, however, when he received him he did not conceal his sympathy for the legitimist cause. This naturally created ill-feeling at Paris, and the French government itself began to be uneasy at the activity of Ultramontanism in France. Little by little the Roman liturgy and the Roman catechism was supplanting the ancient local liturgies and catechisms. The Roman fraternities obtained more and more followers even in influential circles, and the French bishops began to make pilgrimages to Rome in token that they sought their support in the Papacy. It was evident that the spirit of Bossuet and of Gallicanism was retreating before the spirit of Loyola and of Jesuitism. Accordingly the old dislike of the Society of Jesus and of the Roman Church awoke, and it broke out during a contest over freedom of education, which we will describe in detail when we come to depict the inner life of the Roman Church. Liberal Frenchmen, more or less followers of Voltaire in thought, were exasperated at the propaganda which the Jesuits carried on everywhere in France through their missions and spiritual exercises. The students at Paris interrupted the

¹ See above, p. 47.

² Sylvain 270, after *Le Correspondant*, 10th September 1872.

lectures of the Abbé Dupanloup and Lenormand at the Sorbonne, because these two teachers were zealous Catholics; on the other hand, they loudly applauded Michelet and Quinet, when these men attacked Jesuitism in the Collège de France. But the Jesuits did not remain silent. Père Ravignan wrote in defence of his order a courageous pamphlet (*De l'existence et de l'institut des Jésuites*), and other French Catholics appeared in the literary arena with fighting pamphlets.¹

In order to induce Gregory XVI. to withdraw his support from French Jesuitism, Guizot resolved to send the Italian Pellegrino Rossi to Rome as Resident Minister for a time, and Ambassador-Extraordinary, since it was an open secret that the French Minister at Rome, Count de Latour-Maubourg, was more respected than influential. Pellegrino Rossi in his youth, as King Joachim's (Murat's) general commissioner, had been implicated in the Italian battles for liberty. For that reason he had been compelled first to leave Bologna, and at last Italy.² After a long stay in Switzerland, where for many years he worked as a professor at the University of Geneva, he was summoned to France. Guizot, who highly valued his knowledge in public economy and his political abilities, appointed him first to Say's post as Professor of Political Economy at the Collège de France. Afterwards he was made professor also at the *École de Droit*, and he was now thought to be the right man to carry on the difficult negotiations with Rome on the subject of the Jesuits. It could not, of course, do otherwise than awaken uneasiness amongst the papal politicians, that France should choose an exiled Italian, who had married a Protestant, to treat with them for the dissolution of the Jesuit institutions on French soil. "But some alarms are useful," says Guizot in his *Mémoires*.³

At the end of 1844 Pellegrino Rossi went to Italy, where he first visited old friends before reaching Rome in the spring. In his instructions of 2nd March 1845 Guizot charged him to let the papal government understand that there was

¹ Thureau-Dangin : *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet*, 219f.

² F. Bertolini : *Pellegrino Rossi nella storia del risorgimento Italiano* (Bologna 1885), 18f.

³ *Mémoires* VII, 393. Cp. Marco Minghetti : *Miei ricordi* (Torino 1888) I, 183f.

serious dissatisfaction in France with the Jesuits, who in spite of the laws were displaying very marked activity. It would be the easiest thing in the world to put the law in force against the order of Loyola; but Guizot preferred to attain his object without violence. Rossi therefore was to endeavour to induce Rome to close all French houses for novices and professed members of the society, and to impose upon the Jesuits, who wished to remain in France, the duty of submitting to the French episcopate.¹

Rossi had not been long in Rome before he realised how difficult the task was that Guizot had entrusted to him.² He soon discovered that Lambruschini had the Pope completely in his power; but he also perceived that an opposition party was about to be organised with a view to the Conclave which could not be far off. It was for and against Jesuitism that the battle raged; but the Jesuits had the upper hand to begin with. "There are," says Rossi, "three sorts of Jesuits. There are learned members of Loyola's order who do not know much about its policy, and pious Jesuits who are fully persuaded that their order is innocent. By the help of the first kind of Jesuits an impression is made on those who are intellectually well educated, by the second kind on pious souls. But behind these two stands the real Jesuitism, which is now more eager than ever before, and which aims at the old object of Jesuitism—a counter-revolution and a theocracy." And these real Jesuits seemed to Rossi just then to be very confident of victory. One of them said to him: "You will see that in the course of four or five years it will be an established thing, even in France, that the education of youth belongs exclusively to the priesthood." The envoy of France looked upon such expressions as visionary, yet not without a certain danger in them, because the Jesuits possessed very large means, and had developed a considerable activity, which had its centres at Rome, Milan, and Modena. At Rome they were strong through their power over the Roman nobility, who entrusted their children to them; at Milan they had special influence through the large sums of money which were at their disposal; through Modena they came into connexion with the European reaction. The policy of the

¹ Guizot VII, 394f.

² Compare his despatch of 27th April 1845. Guizot VII, 399f.

Jesuits turned at that time, according to Rossi, mostly on two points—their relation to France and the coming Conclave. He was persuaded that neither Gregory XVI. nor the Jesuit General, Roothaan, really knew all the Jesuit schemes. He permitted himself to say that their general had no greater knowledge of the secrets of the order than the Venetian Doge in the last century of the republic had of the policy of Venice. In order to work at Rome it was necessary to discern clearly in which direction it was possible to win influence in Roman society, for opinions and convictions in Rome did not penetrate downwards from above; they mounted upwards from below. It was necessary first to gain influence over those in subordinate positions, then over the leaders; but one who had only the masters on his side, would soon find himself isolated and powerless. The former French ambassadors had, in Rossi's opinion, often made the mistake of entering into connexion only with the Roman nobility; it was important to influence the priests, the advocates, and the business men.

From this point of view Rossi proceeded to act, and he was successful. Little by little the Romans recognised that it would be foolish to sacrifice all the interests of the Papacy in France to those of the Jesuits, and that after the experiences of 1789 and 1830, it might be good policy to keep Loyola's order somewhat in the background. The hot debates on the Jesuit question in the Chamber of Deputies had their echo at Rome, and several sensible Romans considered it reasonable to listen to Rossi, who knew both France and Rome.¹ It also made an impression on many when Thiers in the Chamber of Deputies loudly demanded that if Rome would not give way, the French laws should be fully carried out, and when Louis Philippe said to the papal nuncio at Paris that he neither could nor would risk his crown for the sake of the Jesuits. But the Jesuits would not give in immediately. Their general had this advantage over the French ambassador and all others, that he could at any time obtain access to the Pope, and Rossi therefore thought it best to present a memorandum to the papal Secretary of State, in which he shortly and clearly stated the French government's view of the question in dispute.² Lambruschini received this memorandum

¹ Guizot VII, 410f.

² It is printed in Guizot VII, 419.

with good will, and promised to acquaint the Pope with all the arguments urged by France, although he did not conceal that it was a great demand which was thus pressed upon the Pope—all the more so, as Odilon Barrot had hinted in the chamber that this was only to be a beginning.

After careful consideration, however, Lambruschini thought it wise to give in to the French demands. On 23rd June 1845, Rossi was able to inform his government that Rome had thrown over the French Jesuits,¹ and on 6th July the *Moniteur* contained an official communication that the negotiations which Rossi had conducted with Rome had led to a successful issue. The Jesuit congregation in France was to cease to exist; the Jesuit houses were to be closed, and their novitiates to be dissolved.

These promises on the Pope's part were not fulfilled as quickly as had been expected at Paris. Several of the French bishops had little by little become more ultramontane than the Roman government itself, and they delayed the execution of the agreement with Rome. The Bishop of Poitiers went so far as to call the abolition of the French Jesuit province "a suicide," so that Lambruschini had to remind him that the Jesuits were not very popular in France, and that it would be folly to compel the French government to make new laws against the disciples of Loyola;² and at last even Père Rozaven perceived that there was nothing to do but to give way, because the government had the chambers, the electors, the officials, and the Press all on its side.

We learn from Rossi's despatches how unsettled a state Rome was in, when thoughts began to turn towards a new Conclave. Politically speaking, it was evidently wise of Lambruschini to satisfy France by this temporary sacrifice—all the more so as various signs in the disturbed provinces of the North indicated that the new pope would be confronted with considerable difficulties within his own dominions.

Young Italy had for a long time attracted attention by various manifestoes and proclamations, and in 1843 the party of Mazzini thought to pass from word to deed by raising the banner of revolution in the Papal States. With Naples and the Romagna as bases, they hoped to call forth a revolutionary movement

¹ Guizot VII, 43ff.

² *Ibid.*, 448f.

which would at length obtain for them the mastery of Rome. It was, however, soon apparent that there was no considerable help to be expected from the slow and lazy Neapolitans; but at Bologna the papal Cardinal Legate Spinola ruled with so strong a hand that many inhabitants were driven over by indignation and fear to the side of the revolution. A Bolognese doctor, Muratori by name, gathered together a free-corps in order to begin a guerilla war—Spanish fashion—against the papal troops, in the hope of being joined by several of the smaller towns. After a short-lived success, however, Muratori had to flee into Tuscany, and a price was put upon his head. Afterwards an officer who had returned from Spain, Ribotti, gathered together another free-corps and marched against Imola. The Bishop, Mastai, and his guests, the papal Legate at Ravenna, Cardinal Amat, and the Archbishop of Ravenna, Falconieri, were staying at a villa outside Imola, and they would have fallen into the hands of Ribotti, if they had not been informed at the last moment of what was about to happen, so that they were able to seek refuge in Imola. As soon as they arrived there the gates were shut, and such an effective defence was organised that Ribotti's plan failed entirely, and this free-corps was then disbanded.

To suppress the threatening revolution the papal government proceeded with the greatest rigour. Cardinal Spinola was superseded as legate at Ravenna by Cardinal Vannicelli, famous for his severity; and the new legate began his rule by ordering seven Mazzinians to be executed, so that young Italy now had its martyrs. The proceedings of Vannicelli were so cruel and arbitrary, that the legate at Forlì, Cardinal Gizzi, deprecated the extension of the Bolognese methods of justice into the territories entrusted to him.¹ By this means Cardinal Gizzi laid the foundation of the popular favour which nearly placed him in St Peter's chair. Another cardinal legate, the above mentioned Amat, disapproved also of the papal government's system of suppression, and he even went so far as to warn in time some of the inhabitants of Ravenna, against whom an order of imprisonment from Rome had been issued. As a punishment he was deposed and succeeded by Cardinal Massimo, a Roman

¹ Farini I, 152. Massimo d'Azeglio: *Die jüngsten Ereignisse in der Romagna*, 41.

prince, well known for his severity and his pride. The least suspicion was now sufficient to throw a native of Ravenna into prison, and Cardinal Massimo used every means to establish the power of the Papacy in that troubled region. The result of his work was that a new free-corps was formed, which, after having for a short time found a refuge in the republic of San Marino, took the town of Rimini by surprise. But once again sufficient support from the neighbouring towns was not forthcoming, and the free-corps from Ravenna had to flee into Tuscany, whence its members escaped to France.

Before this free-corps surrendered Rimini, they issued a manifesto addressed to the inhabitants of the Papal States, and to the princes and nations of Europe.¹ This manifesto, which was drawn up by the doctor Luigi Carlo Farini of Faenza, afterwards well known as a statesman and historian, was characterised by a certain moderation, and the demands it made coincided in the main with the memorandum of the Great Powers of the year 1831.² All the political blunders and cruelties of the Papacy since the days of Pius VII. were shortly and clearly stated, and the manifesto ended with an appeal to the infallible Judge in heaven. It demanded amnesty; a more just penal code; the abolition of confiscation and death as a means of punishment for high treason; the exemption of laymen from ecclesiastical jurisdiction and from the tribunal of the Inquisition; election of members of the municipal councils, the provincial councils and the council of State; control of the national debt and the annual budget; the admission of laymen to civil and military posts; public education without the supervision of the Church, except as regards religious instruction; censorship to be restricted to the prevention of blasphemy against God, the Catholic religion and the sovereign, and of violation of the peace of private life; disbanding of the foreign mercenary troops; the establishment of a civil guard, and the introduction of those improvements in the social order "which are dictated by the spirit of the age," and which all the other European governments have introduced.

The answer which the papal government gave to this Rimini

¹ Printed in Farini I, 98f.

² See above, p. 63.

programme. was a display of still greater rigour. When the rumour of the disturbances in Romagna came to Rome, Rossi went immediately to Lambruschini to assure him of the concern felt by France for the security of the Holy See.¹ The cardinal thanked him, but said at the same time that the revolt would be instantly suppressed by force of the military. So it was. The itinerant military tribunals, in which the same men were at once both accusers and judges, were again set in motion, and executions and imprisonments awakened renewed terror. It was then that Massimo d'Azeglio, son-in-law to Alessandro Manzoni, who was at that time living in Tuscany, wrote his pamphlet, *Degli ultimi casi di Romagna*, founded upon reports received from Romagna either by word of mouth or in writing. This pamphlet, which was approved by Balbo and a circle of friends gathered at his house, made a great impression. Twelve thousand copies disappeared in an instant, in spite of the police and the censorship; and even outside of Italy people began to understand more truly the complaints of the Italian friends of liberty, but at the same time also to take alarm at their Chauvinism.²

Massimo d'Azeglio urged in his pamphlet that the necessary alterations in the internal condition of the Papal States should be made as soon as possible, in order to ward off the danger that threatened. He complained of the prohibition of scientific congresses, of the scandalous way in which the Papacy countenanced the gambling spirit among the inhabitants, and of the opposition from high quarters to all attempts to spread education among the people, as well as to the railways, which would give a new impulse to trade in Italy. He reproached the papal government with being suspicious towards foreigners, and he recommended that laymen should be allowed to take part in the government, lest the government should one fine day come to repent that they had not voluntarily surrendered that which they would be obliged by force to resign. But Massimo d'Azeglio was a strong opponent of secret conspiracies and bloody revolutions;

¹ Guizot VII, 450f.

² For an account of how it came into existence, read Massimo d'Azeglio: *I miei ricordi* II, 470f. The author acknowledges that his sources were not perfect: "Il guaio fu che era poco esatto; e quindi il mio libretto, quanto ad esposizione di fatti, come scoprii in appresso, è inesatto anch'esso."

he hoped that if only the citizens courageously proved by the help of the Press how unhappy was the condition of the Papal States, a regeneration would be effected by peaceful means.

Amongst those who had become acquainted with Massimo d'Azeglio's pamphlet before it was printed was Gino Capponi.¹ When he heard it read, he exclaimed: "That is the right way! That is the way to speak, and this must be said. God bless you!" In order to support his friend, he wrote in the *Gazzetta Italiana*, which was published in Paris, an article in which he expressed the hope that the suppression of the revolt might not occasion new cruelties and a renewed oppression of the people.² He asserted that the Pope had received his sovereignty in order that he might maintain his independence, and that the papal sovereignty was distinctly legitimate and more truly founded than that of any other power on the will of the people. But times change. It was now necessary in the Papal States as elsewhere to amend the old forms, and all the more so, since the Pope, in his position as Pope, had necessarily to surround himself with elements from the whole Christian world, and these remained foreigners as regards the Papal States. The political knot ought, according to Gino Capponi, to be loosened in such wise that the Pope should be at the head of the state, but not of the government. The government should be national and should be conducted by laymen, in order that the breach between the Pope and the people might not become incurable. As a matter of fact, Rome needed the Pope more than the Pope needed Rome, and a pope surrounded by the Sacred College would be a more inviolate sovereign than any temporal prince. But Gino Capponi reminded his readers that the movement at Rimini had not been directed like former disturbances against the priests and the altars. Every one acknowledged the rule of the Pope, even those who suffered most under it. It was formerly a misfortune that the Pope was not ruler; it would now be a still greater misfortune if the sovereignty were taken from him. But the

¹ A. von Reumont: *Gino Capponi*, 235.

² It is reprinted in his *Scritti editi e inediti* per cura di Marco Tabarrini (Firenze 1877), I.

altered times required new counsellors, new institutions, and new laws. The division of the ecclesiastical administration from the civil was, according to Capponi, the only means of surmounting all difficulties.

But Lambruschini would in no wise agree to such a division, and Massimo d'Azeglio, at the instigation of Rome, was exiled from Tuscany. He found shelter with Charles Albert, who, in spite of upbraidings from Rome, left him in peace. At many towns in the northern and middle parts of Italy political pamphlets were secretly printed, which sounded like an echo of Massimo d'Azeglio's complaints and demands, and here and there the anger of the people began to find vent in attacks upon the Jesuits. When the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Pisa wished to hand over the management of a high school for girls in the town to the nuns of the order of the Heart of Jesus the populace rose, because these nuns were looked upon as female Jesuits and the forerunners of the order of Loyola. There was a tumult in the streets of Pisa; and afterwards, on the 27th February 1846, two hundred and forty-six respected citizens handed to the governor of the town an address directed against this movement towards making their town a centre of Jesuitism in Tuscany. Even such a good Catholic as Gino Capponi disapproved of this attempt to open the way for the Jesuits into a country which had long shown dislike for the order of Loyola.

The conflict about the Society of Jesus had already commenced in literature. Some utterances of Vincenzo Gioberti in his *Prolegomeni al Primato* (1845) had called forth Padre Francesco Pellico, Silvio's brother, and Padre Curci into the arena in defence of their order; the last-named at the prompting of the General.¹ Gioberti, who considered the Jesuits a real hindrance to church reform, was not silenced. In 1847 he began an extensive work called *Il Gesuita moderno*, which at last became large enough to fill eight octavo volumes. It was printed at Lausanne and much read in Switzerland, where the

¹ *Memorie del Padre Curci* (Firenze 1891), 191. P. Curci relates there that his wealthy order could not give him the 2250 lire necessary for the publication of his apology. He then spoke to a rich macaroni manufacturer, whose confessor he was, and he at once declared himself willing, but proposed afterwards rather to use a small portion of the required sum to hire a man who would give the Abate Gioberti a good sound thrashing. *Op. cit.*, 193f.

Jesuit question just at that time was of the greatest interest. Switzerland was then divided into two camps: a Jesuit camp which expected help from the Madonna of Einsiedeln, and a Radical camp which fought under the banner of freedom and progress.

It was with anxious forebodings of a storm coming over the whole of Europe that Gregory XVI., at the beginning of 1846, felt his strength failing. The tall figure had long been bent; now the lively eyes began to lose their lustre. He heard with a certain satisfaction that the Romans had one evening called the female dancer Cerrito before the curtain eighteen consecutive times; "for," said he, "as long as my Romans applaud dancers, they do not think of making revolutions."¹ But he was not quite easy in mind. On 20th May 1846 he summoned Crétineau-Joly, who has been so often mentioned, to speak with him on a matter of importance. Crétineau-Joly came, and a conversation ensued, in the course of which the ailing Pope confided to the historian of the war of La Vendée what the latter himself calls a political testament. "The condition of Europe, and especially of Italy," so Gregory XVI. is reported to have said to him, "does not permit me to hope that the next pope will have a more peaceful reign than I have had. There is storm in the air; revolutions will soon break out. I shall not be here to keep them down, but I will, before I die, do my successor a service which I hope he will appreciate. Will you conspire with me to attain this end?" When Crétineau-Joly had expressed his willingness, Gregory XVI. said further: "It is my political testament which I confide to you. It means the fulfilment of a wish. You have so often proved that you have the courage to act up to your convictions. Now I pray you to get your pen ready and promise me that, without allowing any hindrance to stop you, you will write the history of the secret societies." To this Crétineau-Joly answered, as might be expected, that the Pope's wish was to him a command. But whence was he to obtain the weapons for this battle? "The arsenal is not far away," Gregory XVI. answered: "Cardinal Bernetti has the keys of it, and he will be more than pleased to surrender them to you. He knows to the bottom the mysterious intrigues of the secret societies. He follows from hour to hour

¹ Maynard: *J. Crétineau-Joly*, 32.

their bloody or ridiculous ramifications, and I gave him long ago orders to collect valuable materials. Cardinal Lambruschini is doing the same, and I myself possess certain documents of the utmost importance." The conversation ended by the Pope giving Crétineau-Joly his blessing and a rosary.¹

The historian of the war in La Vendée and of the order of the Jesuits belongs to the number of historical authors, who use their imagination freely, especially when they relate what they have themselves experienced. But there is probably much truth in this story that the dying Pope was of opinion that an account of the history of the secret societies would at that moment be useful. His successor did not entirely agree with him in this; in 1846 or 1847 he considered such a history "inopportune,"² and Crétineau-Joly did not fulfil the last wish of Gregory. He wrote a part of the intended work, and consulted with Prince Metternich and others about his scheme. But in a moment of depression he threw his manuscript into the fire, since it had become evident to him that Pius IX., out of regard for the rising star of Louis Napoleon, did not wish that at the moment there should be too much said about the secret societies.

A few days after the conversation with Crétineau-Joly, Gregory XVI. was attacked with erysipelas in the face, and on 31st May his condition was hopeless. The next morning at half-past nine he died, alone and forsaken. The diplomatists were taken by surprise; they had not thought that the end was so near.³ When the big bell of the Capitol announced his death, the Romans heard its sound with vexation, for Torlonia was to have given in the next few days a great popular entertainment, which was now given up. As usual at the demise of a pope, the satirists allowed themselves free scope, and from mouth to mouth passed a sonnet with the refrain: *Giacque e ai nemici non lascio perdono*.⁴ When his corpse, as usual, was exhibited in the Chapel of the Sacrament in St Peter's church, Silvagni saw pious crowds kissing the dead Pope's feet, which protruded from the coffin. But he thinks that most of them came out of curiosity; for a generation had grown up which had not

¹ Maynard, 340f.

² *Ibid.*, 378.

³ Rossi's despatch of 1st June. Guizot VII, 463.

⁴ "He died without forgiving his enemies." Several of these satires are to be seen in Silvagni III, 499f.

before seen a pope's funeral, and which was unwilling to miss such an opportunity.

The princes of the Church who had received the purple at the hands of Gregory XVI. erected a monument to his honour in St Peter's, executed by Amici. It represents the Pope in a sitting posture, giving the blessing.

CHAPTER XVII

FIRST YEARS OF PIUS IX

"AT the death of Gregory XVI. the Liberal associations could with difficulty restrain their hatred and their thirst for revenge; the *Sanfedisti* had the upper hand, and they reaped benefit from the general ignorance. That party among the Liberals, who called themselves moderates, made it their object to fight against bad government by lawful resistance, by the help of the Press, and by civil courage; the honest and intelligent section of the friends of the Papacy (*papalini*) acknowledged that reform of one kind or another was necessary. We had only a few badly disciplined troops, who were poorly paid, and not to be trusted. The foreign regiments were good and faithful, but were the object of the jealousy of our soldiers, and of the hatred of the people, and they constituted a heavy burden upon the treasury. Commerce was in a miserable condition, and we had no industry on a large scale. Smuggling had been made into a system, and proved stronger than the government. The police were arbitrary and persecuted the Liberals; town and country alike were not safe against the brigands, who were but ill kept in check. There were no statistics, and all the public departments were in disorder. The taxes and customs were heavy and unjustly distributed, resting almost entirely upon landed property; and the tax on flour, in some parts of the Marches and of Umbria, was bitterly resented. The wealth of the community could not increase because of bad civic and economic laws, because railways were forbidden, and because the large estates as a rule remained in the same hands. Law-books were wanting, and all citizens were not equal in the eye of the law; there were numerous exemptions and privileges. The administration

of justice was intricate, slow, costly, and partial. Instruction and education were on the whole, even as regards religion, insufficient—husks without kernel. Commissions in the army were closed to the educated youth, because they led neither to advantage nor to honour, and because of the contaminating influence of foreign mercenaries.

“A diplomatic career was a privilege of the clergy; the same was the case with politics, administration, and the Civil Service, because only priests could attain to the highest posts and dignities. The censorship of the Press and of foreign papers and books was exceedingly strict and hypocritical. Thousands and thousands of citizens had been ‘warned,’ and were thereby excluded from every honourable and well-paid position in the service of their towns or of the State. There were a great number of families, who after 1831 were persecuted by the government or the *Sanfedisti* from political motives. Nearly two thousand were in exile, proscribed, or under prosecution. There was a standing military commission. Everything that might further or help civilisation was repressed or neglected.

“The high Roman nobility, the dukes, and the princes, paid respect to the Papacy, as an institution to which they owed their good fortunes, their dignities and ancient rights, but they were no friends of the absolute rule of the priestly caste; there was no energy in it, and it was not distinguished either by knowledge or by virtue. The provincial nobility was either in opposition or enmity to the papal government, or else it was quite indifferent; not a few of the nobles in the provinces took part in the various conspiracies. Only a small fraction of the citizens in Rome had by their wealth and other circumstances gained an independent position, and these were not the friends of the government. The cardinals and prelates had numberless clients and servants, and there were many who lived on abuses. There was a multitude of talkative and fraudulent people, an effeminate and sensual crowd, weak, full of flattery for their masters, but without soul, without faith, without vigour. The artisans and lower class in the population of Rome perhaps felt affection for the Pope as the head of the Church, but they did not submit to him as their sovereign and ruler; they were proud of being Romans, wild and combative. The dwellers in the provinces were deeply implicated in the

affairs of the political associations, and were bold partisans. The country population were peaceful, and cherished affection for the head of their religion, and reverence for the clergy; but they were discontented with the heavy taxes. The lower grades of the clergy, both in the capital and in the provinces, were simple, and but little enlightened, and they grumbled at the abuses in Rome and at the bad government; with few exceptions, however, the priests were neither immoral nor troublesome. That part of the priesthood in town, who consisted more of foreigners than of Romans, and who either lived in luxury or at least hoped to be able to do so by the help of abuses, was false and hypocritical, and when circumstances demanded it, were given to factions and parties.

"The government, shortly stated, was neither beloved by its subjects nor generally respected. From foreigners it met with strong censure and ridicule; they saw that fresh movements were needed, and that speedy and real reforms were demanded. The diplomatists feared disturbance and revolution."

It is one of the moderate and patriotic citizens of the Papal States, Luigi Carlo Farini, already mentioned above, who unfolds for us this cheerless picture of the Papal States at the death of Gregory XVI.¹ If we turn to the party of Mazzini the shadows are still deeper. Gregory himself, as we have already said, had a feeling that he was walking on a volcano. During his last illness he had expressed the wish that the Conclave should be opened immediately after his death, and he is supposed to have had it in his mind at an earlier date to issue a document which gave the cardinals permission to proceed immediately to the election of his successor, if there were any danger of the liberty of the Conclave being violated.² For he feared that disturbances would break out in the provinces with the change of pope, and, in that case, first an Austrian and then a French invasion might be expected.³ Radetzky stood ready to occupy the Legations as soon as the least revolutionary movement was observed, and Pellegrino Rossi, who, in spite of his Liberal past and his Protestant wife, had been appointed, a

¹ *Lo stato Romano* I, 143f.

² Lucius Lector: *Le conclave*, 717.

³ Petruccelli della Gattina: *Pie IX.* (Bruxelles 1866), 8. This book is the last volume of the author's great work on the Conclaves; out of regard to the French press law it was published separately.

few days before the death of Gregory XVI., French ambassador to the Vatican,¹ was seen early and late in the circle of the cardinals, engaged in counteracting the influence of Austria. He had received orders from his government to act "according to the Liberal but anti-revolutionary policy which France had inscribed upon her banner," but he had received no further instructions. The interests of France would be satisfied if he could hinder the election of a friend of the Jesuits, a legitimist, or a friend of Austria. It was specially to prevent such an election that Count Rossi was so active that the Romans called him *il conte dello Spirito Santo*.

The sovereigns did not seem this time to have fixed upon particular candidates. Ferdinand, King of Naples, was content with expressing the hope in general that a pope might be elected who was sincerely religious, and a man of experience, and possessed of firm character.² Charles Albert's government wanted "a man, who could set up a strong defence against the enemies who attacked the Church of Christ from all sides,"³ and Austria desired a pope, who was a determined opponent of all political novelties, and who was willing to listen to the friendly advice of the Viennese Court.⁴ Nor do the diplomatists seem to have had any favourites. Seven or eight candidates for the tiara were mentioned, according to what Rossi wrote to Guizot;⁵ but all were more sure which cardinals they did not want, than which they wanted. The people, on the other hand, had made their choice; they were anxious to have the Capucin General Micara for Pope. He was one of the few cardinals who had escaped unscathed amid the pasquinades that flew from mouth to mouth.⁶ The rumour was spread abroad that at the meetings of the College of Cardinals, after the death of Gregory XVI., he had advocated a policy of economy and of Liberal reforms. When he showed himself in the streets he was received with enthusiasm, and inscriptions were scratched on the walls advising his election. He was ill when the Conclave was opened; he was obliged therefore to drive alone to the Quirinal. On the way thither his carriage was surrounded

¹ Guizot VII, 462f.

² Cipolletta, 230.

³ Cappelletti: *Storia di Carlo Alberto* (Roma 1891), 296.

⁴ Bianchi V, 2.

⁵ Guizot VII, 463.

⁶ Silvagni III, 501.

by a crowd which greeted him as Pope. He rose up in the carriage, and it made a strong impression on the people when he cried out with his strong voice: "Be careful! with me you will get the gallows as well as bread." Micara's commanding figure, that called to mind the Moses of Michelangelo, and the favourite cardinal's well-known severity, gave these words a special weight. People understood, as Gualterio said, that in his capacity of Capucin General he could be not only as democratic as a Jacobin, but also as absolute as a Sixtus V.¹

Without regard to the wish of Gregory XVI. for a quicker summoning of the Conclave, the cardinals arranged for the burial of the late Pope in the customary manner. From morning to night the bells were tolled from all the towers and domes of Rome, and in the Chapel of the Sacrament in St Peter's a colossal temple-like building was erected for the coffin. To the superstitious Romans it was a bad omen, that a huge allegorical representation of Religion that was to crown the whole building fell down and broke into a thousand pieces, so that they had to be satisfied with a smaller one which had been kept from the *Castrum Doloris* of Pius VIII. But there was one good thing about the ill-luck—namely, that the Romans could not agree how far the omen was to be considered a judgment on the reign of Gregory XVI. or a forerunner of great misfortunes under his successor.

The cardinals were depressed when they proceeded this time to the Conclave. On the road to Rome soldiers were posted who watched all travellers, and a message was sent to Ancona to forward to Rome the few guns which the see of St Peter had at its disposal. The cardinals, who were legates in the Legations unwillingly left their posts, and chose the strongest prelates to act on their behalf during their absence.² There were at that time sixty-two members of the Sacred College in all. Thirty of these lived at Rome, seventeen in the papal provinces, eight in other parts of Italy, the rest in foreign countries.³ Only forty-nine cardinals were present at

¹ Cipolletta, 233. H. Reuchlin: *Geschichte Italiens* I, 287. Massimo d'Azeglio: *Correspondance politique*, par E. Rendu (Paris 1867), 4f.

² Pasolini: *Memorie*, 60.

³ Freiherr v. Helfert: *Gregor XVI. und Pius IX., Ausgang und Anfang ihrer Regierung* (Prag 1895), 62.

the appointed time of meeting.¹ Most of those who could attend proceeded on the evening of the 14th June to the Quirinal, in pouring rain, so pressed by the surrounding crowds that the eminent princes of the Church could neither walk in the proper order nor preserve their dignity.² The spectators thought that there were remarkably few fine faces in the long procession.

As soon as the procession had passed into the Quirinal the crowd dispersed. The members of the Conclave went straight into the chapel, and there Cardinal Macchi delivered an address in which he admonished the cardinals to hasten with the election of a new pope, and to forget all worldly considerations. But preparations had been made for a long Conclave. Not less than 6,000 voting papers had been printed, which would suffice for three months, if two votes were taken each day.

The usual opposition between Conservatism and Liberalism appeared in this Conclave as in others.³ On one side stood Lambruschini, with the "Gregorians" and the cardinals friendly to the Jesuits, who considered that all new ideas ought to be totally kept at a distance, and that the least giving way would only foster new and more extreme demands. Opposed to them was a group of cardinals, who, partly out of sympathy, partly from fear, wished to see a pope who would be to the liking of the people by reforming the worst abuses, and who would keep off the threatening storm. To this group belonged such men as Micara, Gizzi, and Oppizzoni, the Cardinal Archbishop of Bologna, who had declined to receive the Jesuits into his diocese. There could be no question of electing two of the most important cardinals, Lambruschini and Bernetti, because they had been Secretaries of State; and nobody believed seriously in Micara's election, because an old saying declares that he who goes into the Conclave as Pope, will always go out as Cardinal.

When the first vote was taken on the morning of 15th June, Lambruschini obtained nine, and Mastai eight

¹ The names in Silvagni III, 563f.

² Count Ludolf's despatch in Petruccelli della Gattina, 19.

³ Compare the article in *Röm.-ital. Lage beim Wechsel der päpstl. Regierung* in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* for 7th and 8th July 1846, *Beilage*.

votes.¹ As had been customary in the latest Conclaves, a vote *per accesso* was immediately taken after the real vote, and Lambruschini then obtained six more votes, Mastai two. A great many cardinals therefore had abstained from voting. In the evening Lambruschini received only thirteen votes, but Mastai received seventeen. It was reported afterwards that Falconieri, who belonged to Lambruschini's group, and really was one of its candidates, had firmly declared that he himself would not take the tiara, but that he had recommended Mastai. In the forenoon of 16th June Lambruschini's votes decreased to ten, whilst Mastai *per accesso* polled twenty-seven. His *aura* was therefore unmistakable, and in the afternoon, whilst some of the cardinals were taking siesta, others went round from cell to cell to enlist votes for Mastai, who had no small chance of being elected, because they knew much that was good of him, but nothing bad. The effect of the agitation was seen when the evening vote was taken; Mastai, who himself was one of the three tellers who were to count the votes, became more and more nervous the more votes he counted for himself. When twenty-eight votes had been recorded for him, he turned faint, and the perspiration stood in beads on his forehead, and he begged his colleagues to let another continue the counting. This would have interrupted the voting, and by such an interruption it would become invalid. Therefore the cardinals sitting nearest to him asked him to rest awhile and then go on again. He did so, and meanwhile pointed remarks were let fall by the witty cardinals. Thus Bernetti whispered to his neighbour: "Well, after the policemen come the ladies." The conclusion of the voting is variously related. According to one account, Cardinal Mastai is said to have fainted when he had received thirty-four votes; according to another he knelt down with folded hands and prayed the cardinals to choose another more worthy.² He obtained altogether thirty-seven out of fifty votes, and, when the polling was finished, he said with a trembling voice: "O God, I am Thy unworthy servant; Thy will be done!"

Outside on the square the Romans stood and looked up

¹ Compare Petruccelli della Gattina, 24f., Reuchlin I, 288f., and Helfert 70f., who do not always agree as to the numbers.

² F. Venosta: *Papa Pio IX.*, 17f. Helfert, 143.

with excitement at the little chimney through which the smoke of the burned voting papers was to mount. The marshal of the Conclave informed the diplomatists that the papal apparel had been sent for, and it was also rumoured amongst the waiting crowd. When they further heard that the messenger was to ask for very small shoes for the new Pope, it was believed that Gizzi, who was short of stature and had small feet, had been chosen, and the enthusiasm was great amongst all the friends of Roman liberty; the words of Massimo d'Azeglio in his *Casi di Romagna* about this able and honest prelate, who abhorred police measures and maintained order by moderation,¹ had made Gizzi the favourite of the people. The rumour was so far believed that Gizzi's family in Rome received congratulations, and people were already on the road to Ceccano, who wished to be the first to carry the glad tidings to the popular cardinal's native town.² At home, in Gizzi's palace, the servants broke everything they laid their hands on, according to a time-honoured custom, because their master was hereafter to live in the Quirinal or the Vatican. The false rumour was so widely accepted that Giuseppe Spada found it very difficult to make even "distinguished persons" believe that Cardinal Mastai was really the fortunate man.³

Early on 17th June the Quirinal was again surrounded by a swaying crowd. At seven o'clock the Loggia was opened, and a little later the Camerlengo, Cardinal Riario Sforza, accompanied by the master of ceremonies of the Conclave, who carried a lance with a cross, stood forward to inform the people that the Cardinal of Imola had been elected as St Peter's successor, and had assumed the name of Pius IX. This communication was a disappointment to many who had expected to hear of Gizzi's election, and when Pius IX. appeared himself to bless the people he was received somewhat coldly.⁴ The enthusiasm was greater when the new Pope, in a state carriage, drawn by six horses, followed by sixty carriages with the cardinals and highest officials of the Papal States, afterwards drove from the Quirinal to the Vatican to be

¹ *Die jüngste Ereignisse in der Romagna*, 41.

² *Augsburg. Allg. Zeitung* for 3rd July 1846.

³ G. Spada: *Storia della rivoluzione di Roma* (Firenze 1868) I, 42.

⁴ Cp. the despatches in Petruccelli della Gattina, 31f.

enthroned. The charm and gentleness which stamped the appearance of the new Pope impressed all, especially the women, who vied with each other in exclaiming: *Ah, ch'è bello!* A less sentimental nature, in the person of Count Helmuth von Moltke, who was then at Rome as adjutant to Prince Henry of Prussia, long remembered "the beautiful countenance" of the new Pope as he had seen him passing in the glass chariot on his way from the Quirinal to the Vatican.¹ The common people knew enough of him to call him *their* Pope. A story goes that when Lambruschini entered the Conclave, he said to Micara: "Now, which of us two will be Pope?" to which the bold Capucin General answered: "If the devil inspires the cardinals it will certainly be one of us two, but if the Holy Spirit inspires them the good Mastai will be Pope."² In order to make the new Pope better liked, the rumour was spread abroad that Archbishop Gaysruck of Milan, who was to have been the agent of Austria at this Conclave, but arrived two days too late, brought with him the veto of the Austrian government against Cardinal Mastai.³ From the *Memoirs* of Metternich, however, we see that this rumour had no foundation. The Austrian chancellor, on the contrary, in a private letter to his ambassador at Rome calls the news of the election: *une bonne nouvelle*.⁴

Who was this Cardinal Mastai who succeeded to the heritage of St Peter in such difficult circumstances?

The Mastai family came originally from Crema; but about 1550 a Francesco Mastai settled at Venice, and his son, Giovanni Maria Mastai, moved to Sinigaglia.⁵ Under Pope Urban VIII. a Mastai defended this town against the Venetian fleet, and half a century afterwards the Duke of Parma and Piacenza elevated the family to the rank of Counts. After this one of the Counts Mastai married an heiress to the fortune of the house of Ferretti, and the descendants of this couple called themselves Mastai-Ferretti. Count Girolamo Mastai-Ferretti, who was Gonfaloniere of Sinigaglia, married the beautiful Caterina

¹ H. von Moltke: *Gesammelte Schriften und Denkwürdigkeiten* (Berlin 1892) I, 25.

² Massimo d'Azeglio: *Corresp. politique*, 4.

³ Petruccelli della Gattina, 15.

⁴ The despatch in Metternich: *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 243f.

⁵ Venosta, 46f. Silvagni III, 538f. Helfert, 63f.

Sollazzi, and their son was Giovanni Maria Giovanni Battista Pietro Pellegrino Isidoro, who was born 13th May 1792.¹

The childhood of Giovanni Maria Mastai was passed during the years when the waves of revolution were passing over France and Italy, and the little boy was early taught to pray for the much-trying Pius VI., who seemed likely to be the last of St Peter's successors. Giovanni Maria was a weakly child, who suffered from attacks of epilepsy. In 1803 his father took him to Volterra, where he was to attend the school of the Scolopi, and there the astronomer, Inghirami, amongst others, was his—and some years later also Felix Orsini's—teacher. It was his mother's wish that he should enter the service of the Church, but his health seemed at first to render the fulfilment of this wish impossible.

In 1808 he was sent to Rome, to his uncle, Paolino Mastai, who was a canon of St Peter's; but the next year he returned to Sinigaglia, as his uncle considered it best to leave Rome after the carrying away of Pius VII. He then remained at his parents' house until the Restoration. On his way back to Rome Pius VII. passed through Sinigaglia. The Gonfaloniere presented his son to him, and shortly afterwards Giovanni Maria returned with his uncle to the Eternal City. About his early life at Sinigaglia, and his first years after the return to Rome, some of his Italian biographers relate certain things based upon stories told by friends of his youth, which are supposed to cast a reflexion upon his character. Sometimes he is represented as an attempt at a modern Alexander Borgia; sometimes it is related that he had been initiated into the mysteries of the secret societies. This is scarcely credible; and the stories of his youthful excesses evidently bear the appearance of having originated in a hatred of the Papacy, and especially of Pius IX. Probably the truth is that the good-looking young Count Mastai made an impression upon the hearts of the ladies, and that he himself was not insensible to female beauty. Several witnesses testify that he was enamoured of the beautiful Elena Albani, who married Count Litta, and

¹ The certificate of baptism with the names of the godfathers is in Venosta, 49f. The baptism was performed by Girolamo Mastai's brother, Andrea Mastai, then Canon, afterwards Bishop, of Pesaro.

that he thought of marrying Teodora Valle, who afterwards became the mother of the engineer Luigi Gabet.¹

After the return to Rome he wished to become an officer; perhaps the desire for a soldier's life was awakened in him, while he lived amongst the officers of Murat's army at Sinigaglia. The canon of St Peter's applied to Prince Barberini to get his nephew a place in the papal *Guardia Nobile*, which was to be formed, but Consalvi gave a decided refusal; an epileptic could not possibly be an officer. This rejection pained the young Count, and when a hope of becoming assistant to one of the canons of St Peter's also failed, perhaps for the same reason, he was near to desperation. Some say that in his distress he opened his heart to Cardinal Annibale della Genga (Leo XII.) and to Falconieri, who afterwards became cardinal; others relate that it was one of his youthful friends, the advocate Cattabene of Ancona, who saved him from despair.² In great dejection over the disappointments which seemed to destroy all prospects of a position in the army and the hierarchy, and perhaps weighed down also by heartache, Giovanni Mastai walked out of Rome along the Tiber, and the yellow-gray waters of the river had for him that day something tempting in them. On his way he met with Cattabene, and when the latter perceived how it fared with his friend, he took him to the charity school of Tata Giovanni, where his confessor, Storaci, lived. Storaci, who was a practical person, gave the depressed young man a situation as a teacher at Tata Giovanni, and by employing him and taking good care of his health, he succeeded in getting rid of both his melancholy and his epilepsy.

During his work at Tata Giovanni,³ so called from the children's friend, Tata (that is, Papa) Giovanni Borghi, who died in 1798, Mastai was more and more strongly drawn to an ecclesiastical career, and when he had gathered some imperfect theological knowledge at the Roman Academy, he was ordained priest by Bishop Incontri of Volterra, and said his first Mass on Easter Day 1819 in the little chapel of Sant' Anna dei Falignami, where the children from Tata Giovanni

¹ Silvagni III, 541f. Several anecdotes of the love affairs of Giovanni Mastai are found in Petruccelli della Gattina, 34f. and Vésinier: *Pie IX.* (Berlin 1861), 5f.

² Petruccelli della Gattina, after Cattabene's own account.

³ Venosta, 59f.

worshipped. At first, on account of his ailment, he was only allowed to celebrate in the presence of another priest, but after he had been free from epileptic fits for a good while this restriction was removed. His kindness of heart was often shown during his life with the orphans. It was especially the memories of Tata Giovanni, which made the common people of Rome call him at once *their* Pope. Afterwards he came to Sinigaglia on Home Mission service, and there he gathered great crowds around him when he preached in the church or in the lighted market place. After his activities at Sinigaglia, he was sent on a long voyage. The Bishop of Città di Castello, Mgr. Muzzi, had to go to Chili in 1822 to put church matters on a proper footing after the civil war.¹ In spite of Consalvi's anxieties, Giovanni Mastai was chosen to be his companion, and although the journey was in many respects troublesome, and without result, it was very beneficial to the young priest from Tata Giovanni. His health was improved by the long sea voyage, and he showed such courage and so much presence of mind on the way that Leo XII., immediately after his return (1825), appointed him Canon of Santa Maria in Via Lata, and afterwards head of the great benevolent institution of San Michele in Ripa Grande, with which were connected various extensive charities.

Two years afterwards, when the Archbishopric of Spoleto, to which Sinigaglia belonged, became vacant, Leo XII. entrusted him with that see, and on 24th May he was consecrated in St Pietro in Vincoli by Cardinal Castiglioni, afterwards Pius VIII. Of his pastoral life at Spoleto many incidents are related worthy of a Fénelon, and when the Revolution broke out in 1831 the Archbishop of Spoleto endeavoured to mitigate the disasters of war by a large beneficence. His brothers were implicated in the revolt, and one of them was even exiled. This was well known, and part of the halo, which in the eyes of many surrounded the revolutionaries, was reflected upon Archbishop Mastai, who was always gentle and kind even to the Liberals. Gregory XVI. did not at first look with favour upon the Archbishop of Spoleto, who, in his opinion, was too lenient towards Liberalism. When it was suggested to him that he should make Mastai a cardinal, he dismissed the proposal with

¹ Silvagni III, 544f.

the bitter remark, that in the house of Mastai even the cats were Liberal.¹ Nevertheless he appointed him Bishop of Imola, a bishopric which was a *vescovado cardinalizio*, and a sure promise that its occupant should have the hat;² but it was not until 1840 that Mastai received the cardinal's purple.

At Imola Mastai continued his charitable activity, but there he had also a good opportunity of seeing Italian Liberalism at close quarters. He often met with the young Count Giuseppe Pasolini, who lived at Montericco near Imola. Pasolini praises the Cardinal's economy, his goodness, and his zeal for elevating the morals of the clergy, and he relates that the books of Massimo d'Azeglio, Gioberti, and Balbo, and the reports of the scientific congresses, so hated by Gregory XVI., found their way to the episcopal palace at Imola.³ Indeed, when the Cardinal of Imola left for the Conclave in 1846, he packed in his trunks several of the books which had been issued by the New Guelphists in order to direct the new Pope's attention to this literature.⁴ It is no wonder therefore that a friend of liberty like Pasolini bade him farewell with the wish that he might himself be elected Pope, so that he might proclaim and bless from the chair of St Peter the principles they had so often discussed together, to the happiness of the Church and of their unfortunate country. Such vain desires were, however, undoubtedly foreign to the mind of Cardinal Mastai. He took but little money with him to the Conclave, for he was convinced that he would soon be able to return to his bishopric.⁵ But in one of the legends which have encircled Pius IX. it is related that at a place on his way to Rome a white dove alighted on his carriage, and when the people heard who it was that sat in the carriage, they broke out in shouts of joy, and greeted him as *il papa della colomba*.

He was one of the seven or eight candidates who were mentioned before the Conclave as possible. On 16th June the Sardinian envoy, Count di Broglia, wrote to his govern-

¹ Helfert 65 with the Archduke Albrecht as informant. See Helfert, p. 143.

² This removal from an archiepiscopal to an episcopal charge has by some been considered a degradation and punishment, because the Archbishop of Spoleto is said to have helped Prince Louis Napoleon, afterwards Napoleon III., to flee from the Papal States. This view is held by Döllinger: *Kleinere Schriften*, 559.

³ Pasolini: *Memorie*, 58f.

⁴ Pasolini, 61, according to Balbo.

⁵ Giuseppe Giusti: *Memorie inedite* (Milano 1890), 68.

ment before the election was made known, in a description of the different *Papeggianti*: "Mastai is a man with a good sound understanding (*un uomo di testa quadra*), and he uses his money to do good. Some blame him for watching over the duties and the morals of the Church with too great zeal; but he has genial manners, and he is both conciliatory and moderate. He is at home in all ecclesiastical matters, but he does not understand the art of governing. He will soon, however, make up for that by his common sense, and with the help of able ministers."¹ On the day following the election Pellegrino Rossi wrote to Guizot: "The new Pope belongs to a theological school, well known at Rome, which unites much piety to high ideas and tolerance. He is beloved in the Legations, and is said to be good." And he also related, that Pius IX. had said to him that he would "with the greatest satisfaction" see him as French ambassador at Rome.² Although Metternich was closely connected with Lambruschini and the Gregorians,³ even he, as we have seen, felt satisfied with the new Pope, of whose excellent qualities he heard so much. The Conclave which was so quickly ended was to his mind a witness of the power of the religious spirit to cause all differences of opinion to disappear; and he had the best hope that Pius IX. would succeed in frustrating all evil designs on the part of the enemies of civil order, and in infusing new courage into those who consecrated their lives to the defence of the unshakable principles which make empires to live and prosper.⁴

But general satisfaction was also felt outside the circle of the diplomatists. Pius IX.'s old friend, Count Marchetti of Bologna, told Giuseppe Giusti much that was good about the new Pope's character.⁵ He represented him as a man, who always thought before he acted, and carried a matter through which he had began. "Every time he has any important matter on hand," said Count Marchetti, "he asks, he listens, and takes counsels with others; after that he retires for an hour or so to pray, and he then makes his decision." Those who knew the gentle

¹ Petruccelli della Gattina, 18.

² Guizot VIII, 341.

³ The private despatch to Count Lützow in Metternich's *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 242.

⁴ Despatch of 28th June 1846; *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 244.

⁵ G. Giusti: *Memorie inedite*, 69f.

and apparently pliable cardinal somewhat more intimately were aware that in his inmost nature there was an inflexible firmness. He said of himself, "I am a stone; where I fall I lie,"¹ and when Incontri, the Bishop of Volterra, who had given him the tonsure, heard of his election, he exclaimed, "Giovanni Mastai is a stiff-necked person who will give the world plenty to do."²

What follows will show that Pius IX. quickly sank in Prince Metternich's estimation, and that the mild and soft-hearted Pope only revealed his character as that of a stone and of a stiff-necked man after having passed through heavy trials. The story of his papacy will also show that his elder brother, Gabriello Mastai, was right, when he used to say that if Giovanni Maria were cut up into little pieces, there would grow out of each piece, as from a polypus, a priest.³ Pius IX. was first and foremost the priest. Had there rested upon him somewhat more of the spirit of Gregory VII. and Innocent III., the drama which is now to pass before us would probably have had another issue.

When Pius IX. succeeded to the government, he retained provisionally the two Under-Secretaries of State for Home and Foreign Affairs, Giovanni Battista Canella and Vincenzo Santucci; he felt no inclination to bind himself by the immediate appointment of a Secretary of State. On the 20th June an announcement was issued from the Home Office, to the effect that His Holiness intended immediately to take such steps as would promote the welfare of his beloved subjects.⁴ The next day he was solemnly crowned in the Lateran church, and in spite of the heat and the sirocco the streets were filled with crowds, who greeted St Peter's successor with great shouts of joy, when he drove in his golden carriage from the Quirinal to the Lateran. The joy became yet greater, when people heard that the new Pope had provided with a small dowry a thousand young girls from all the Papal States, and had given orders that a great many of the objects pawned within the last three months at the *Monte di Pietà* were to be delivered to the owners without payment. Many had expected at the coronation itself a decree granting a general amnesty, but those

¹ Reuchlin I, 291.

² Silvagni III, 567.

³ Minghetti: *Miei ricordi* I, 190.

⁴ Helfert, 73f.

who had any political insight understood that such a serious step demanded longer deliberation and greater preparation.

Three days after the coronation it was rumoured that Pius IX. had formed a council (*dicastero di sorveglianza*) to watch over all branches of the administration, and to make proposals for alterations and improvements both in the government and in the exercise of justice. This council was to consist of the six cardinals, Lambruschini, Mattei, Macchi, Bernetti, Gizzi, and Amat; the first three on behalf of the old *régime*, the last three as the advocates of reform. Lambruschini, who was called in derision the "head of the corpse of despotism," was so much affected by disappointment at not being made pope, that he asked permission to live in the country for a time to regain his health; nor did Bernetti care to be present at the inauguration of the new era, and he also asked to be excused. But the others met together, and Pius IX. appointed as secretary to the council Mgr. Giovanni Corboli-Bussi, a noble prelate of Urbino, who had been secretary to Cardinal Lambruschini, and who quickly, in spite of his youth, became the most intimate friend and counsellor of the new Pope.¹

The first act of the new Pope was greeted everywhere with joy, because it was looked upon as an introduction to a long series of reforms. General approval was also evoked by the facts that the new Pope did not choose a Jesuit, but his old tutor, the large-minded Abate Graziosi, as his confessor,² and that economy and frugality were at once introduced into the papal household. For the first time also since the days of Clement XIV. the Pope was seen on foot in the streets of Rome, accompanied only by a prelate or two, and a few Swiss Guards, and whether he appeared walking or driving, "the father of the people" was saluted with loud shouts of *Evviva*. From Bologna and Ancona came the report that the former feverish unrest was quieting down; in the Legations, as elsewhere, the future was looked forward to with trust and hope, and people greeted with joy the new era that was to come as if it had already commenced. The sanguine Romans, who with their lively imagination pictured to themselves a golden age of freedom and happy days, carried the other inhabitants of the Papal States, and indeed the whole of Italy, with them, and the

¹ Silvagni III, 568f.

² Döllinger, 593.

Mazzinians accordingly considered it advisable to keep quiet for the present.

The Liberals in the Legations, who had firmly discountenanced all attempts at a revolution, thought nevertheless that they ought to show the world that it was not want of courage or of cohesion that kept them from action.¹ Marco Minghetti, then twenty-eight years of age, drafted a petition for reforms, which was to be forwarded to the Conclave on behalf of the town of Bologna, and through Gioacchino Murat's daughter, the Marchioness Letizia Pepoli, Count Marchetti was persuaded to fix his respected name at the head of the list of signatories. This address,² which appealed to the often-mentioned memorandum of 1831, and its demand for the introduction of councils for the various provinces, stated that everything had become worse in the last fifteen years, and that the need of reforms was now even greater. Similar addresses came from Ferrara, Forlì, and Ravenna, in some cases headed by the names of the Gonfalonieri; but they did not reach Rome until after the papal election. To Pius IX. they were signs of what many of the best citizens, and especially the educated youth, expected of the new Pope. There appeared also an anonymous "address to the successor of Gregory XVI.,"³ which passed a severe censure upon the late Pope, and a keen criticism upon the administration of justice in the States of the Church; and the anonymous author demanded not only new codes of law and liberation of all political prisoners, but also the expulsion of all the foreign troops, and the suppression of the order of the Jesuits, "the moral plague of the Catholic world." At Verona a lampoon was published against the Jesuits,⁴ and with the enthusiasm of the Romans for Pius IX. were often mingled contemptuous allusions to his predecessor, and attacks upon the order of Loyola. There were also several authors, who, like Leopoldo Galeotti in his book *Della sovranità temporale dei Papi*, treated the delicate question of the sovereignty of the

¹ Minghetti I, 186f.

² Printed in Minghetti I, 188f.

³ *Indirizzo al successore di Gregorio XVI., scritto per cura di un galantuomo* (Italia 1846); see Helfert, 8of.

⁴ Helfert, 143.

popes from the point of view of the New Guelphism.¹ Galeotti tried to show that the temporal government of the popes had become in the course of time more and more impossible, and that the world must now insist upon its passing over into lay hands, but in such a way that the independence of the Papal See should on no account be infringed.

These pleas for freedom and wishes for reform made an impression upon Pius IX. The first work of the new council was, as the Liberals had expected, to consider the extension of the amnesty which was to herald the new era. Several of the cardinals had great scruples about granting amnesty to all political offenders, but Mgr. Corboli-Bussi, who had the ear of Pius IX. as no one else had, strengthened his master on this point, so that Pius at length set all hesitation aside. In July the decree of amnesty, which had been signed the previous day, exactly a month from the Pope's election, was published in Rome a couple of hours before sunset, and it caused unbounded exultation. Everywhere in the city the shout was heard: "To Monte Cavallo! to the Quirinal!" and the piazza in front of that palace was black with people, who called for a sight of the Liberal-minded Pope. The wax-candle shops were stormed, and soon the whole square in front of the Quirinal was lighted up as if it were day. Three times in the course of the evening Pius IX. had to show himself to the rejoicing people, and there was no end to the shouts of *Evviva*. Even sceptics and freethinkers, who had not been inside a church door for many years, hastened to the churches in their enthusiasm to praise God and pray for the blessing of heaven on the kindly Pope. The papal cockade, which had for a long time been held in derision, became all of a sudden a sign of honour, which everybody wished to wear, and in the streets they sang:

"Long live our father, the good shepherd
Whom heaven has sent to the flock."²

In the preamble to the decree of amnesty,³ Pius IX.

¹ Minghetti I, 193f.

² H. Stieglitz: *Erinnerungen an Rom* (Leipzig 1848), 6f.

³ Printed amongst the documents in L. Cappelletti: *Storia di Carlo Alberto e del suo regno* (Roma 1891), 568f. In German and Italian in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* for 25th July 1846.

informed his faithful subjects that it had pained him deeply, that not a few families were hindered from taking part in the general joy at his elevation to St Peter's chair, because one or another of their members were imprisoned for offences against civil order or the sacred rights of the legitimate sovereign. It was for this reason that he had determined to remit the remainder of their sentences to all political offenders, on their declaring in writing that in the future they would be good subjects; and all who were exiled for political reasons received permission on the same conditions to return home. Furthermore, all criminal proceedings for political offences were to be stopped immediately, unless the accused themselves wished them to be continued because they expected to be acquitted. Only with regard to the few priests, officers, and civil officials who were condemned for political offences, Pius IX. reserved for himself a closer examination of the individual cases. The decree ended with the expression that even if the successor of St Peter were to be disappointed in his hopes that the amnesty would bring about peace in the country, he would still, though with sorrow, remember that mercy is always one of the sweetest attributes of sovereignty, but justice its first duty.

The papal decree of amnesty was not greeted with such undivided applause in other countries as it was in Rome. Guizot rejoiced that a power, which for so long had taken the lead in Christian civilisation, showed itself still able to carry on the time-honoured task.¹ But Metternich did not look upon matters so favourably. When the news of the amnesty reached Königswart, Princess Metternich wrote in her diary, that the decree had been drawn up in the spirit of her husband.² But the prince would scarcely have so expressed himself. In a memorandum which he sent to Count Lützow a few days before the decree was issued, with the intention that his "good counsels" might go further and reach Pius IX., he expressed himself against the word "amnesty" itself, because by using that word "a crime is changed into an error." He would prefer the word "pardon," because this presupposes the confession of guilt and the existence of a power which can forgive, but which can also

¹ *Mémoires* VIII, 343.

² Metternich: *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 153.

punish if it so prefers. The magistrate, as the servant of God, must imitate God, who shows His mercy by forgiving, but who also requires repentance before He forgives.¹ In a despatch of 6th August in the same year, Metternich expressed himself as highly sceptical regarding the working of the papal amnesty, because he was convinced that those to whom it had been granted were "inveterate agitators for a movement which aimed at an overthrow of the whole order of society."² This scepticism was not quite groundless. It very soon became apparent that several of those affected by the amnesty had lost the inclination for work. The committee which collected money for them had not always happy experiences,³ and Pius IX. soon discovered that the dark forebodings of Metternich were being fulfilled. But for the moment Santucci was to reassure the Austrian chancellor, through Count Lützow, by the information that the amnesty granted was undoubtedly in the closest agreement with the wise and Conservative principles set forth in the memorandum referred to.⁴

But Metternich had not only given good advice as regards the amnesty. He had also expressed his opinion about the peculiar difficulties of the Papal States with regard to government, and about the inconvenience of having the administration divided between two ministries; and he had also attempted to enlighten the Pope as to the difference between just and prudent acts, which might be said to be demanded by common sense and duty, and concessions, which were a sign of weakness, in the same way as when a man lived upon his capital instead of using only the interest.⁵ At the issue of the amnesty Pius IX. had not needed a Secretary of State, and perhaps he did not wish to have one, in order that he might himself alone enjoy the honour of such an act of grace; but if reforms were to be put in hand he must needs have a minister. On 20th July he finally chose Pasquale Gizzi, the people's favourite. As a diplomatist, Gizzi belonged to the school of Consalvi, and, whilst he was nuncio at Brussels and in Switzerland, he had shown himself to be of a peace-making and conciliatory nature; and we have already seen how popular he was as legate at

¹ Metternich VII, 250.

² *Ibid.*, 173.

⁴ Helfert, 90f.

■ Minghetti I, 196.

⁵ Metternich VII, 248f.

Forlì. Nobody doubted his good heart, but those who got to know him more intimately complained of an unfortunate lack of character, and of inability to make a decision.¹ It was a misfortune for Pius IX. that he should have at his side a minister who had the same defects of character as himself. The two Under-Secretaries of State continued, however, to serve under the new secretary, who had in them good and tried helpers; and in Mgr. Corboli-Bussi the Minister for Foreign Affairs gained a new and important force. Many of the Liberals looked with confidence and hope to this young man, who came of a Liberal family, and who—if the rumour were true—had made the final draft for the decree of amnesty. But Corboli-Bussi, who died young of an insidious malady, did not really belong to the Liberal school. He must rather be looked upon as a forerunner of the modern Catholic Socialism. Political reforms interested him very little; but early and late he thought of means for improving the moral and material conditions of the common people, and he considered that such could much more easily and more surely be brought about by a paternal government than by Liberal institutions.²

Not until 8th August could the new Secretary of State, who was sorely troubled with gout, enter upon the duties of his office. He at once stated definitely to the foreign diplomatists that the papal government intended to follow a sound policy, which by suitable administrative improvements would lead the Papal States forward on the path of justice; but it had no intention whatever of giving in to Liberal tendencies or to the empty theories of the revolutionary propaganda.³ He expressed to the Austrian ambassador his great admiration for Prince Metternich, and he asked Count Lützow to do all he could to make the mighty chancellor trust the policy of the Roman see.⁴ Towards France the Pope himself made use of similar language. When Count Rossi, at the end of August 1846, was received by him, Pius IX. said: "A pope ought not to devote himself to

¹ Minghetti (I, 216) speaks of his "grande irresolutezza nel carattere." Cappelletti (299) of his "perpetua incertezza d'animo."

² Minghetti I, 218.

³ Cp. Count Lützow's despatch to Metternich of 25th August 1846. Helfert, 92, 145.

⁴ Helfert, 92f.

Utopias. Would any one believe that there really are people who talk to me about an Italian league of which the Pope should be head? Is such a thing possible? would the Great Powers allow it? It is but a chimera."¹

Such an opinion might seem to indicate that Pius IX. had completely done with the dream of the New Guelphism. The truth is that he had no programme at all, but was swayed by two currents of thought. Sentimentalist as he was, he might one day be taken with the fantasies of Gioberti and the New Guelphs; but next day he could speak as if he approved of Prince Metternich's Italian policy. He had a deeply-rooted desire for popularity, for being surrounded by the *Evvivas* of the crowd in the streets; but, on the other hand, he could not bear to see sour faces among the men of the old *régime*, and he became uneasy when the "Gregorians," the Jesuits, and the *Sanfedisti* put their heads together and aired their doubts as to the possibility of reconciling papal Liberalism with true Catholic orthodoxy. The Liberals were resolved to move forward by slow degrees, but to make use of every opportunity for advocating the cause of freedom and nationality.² When Pius IX. was in his Liberal mood he could rejoice over this sensible method of procedure, but when the traditions of the Holy See and the anxieties of Prince Metternich got the upper hand, it vexed him to hear these continually repeated, unrestrained demands for a government of laymen instead of the *régime* of cardinals, and for a reduction of the papal army, for the sending home of the Swiss regiments and the institution of a civil guard. And it grieved him when he discovered that the wolves to whom he had granted amnesty had by no means been transformed into church lambs, but that Prince Metternich was right when he said that the amnesty had opened the door for professional incendiaries and Radetzky when he affirmed that those people were still "the old rascals."

Count Lützow did not delay in reporting his observations regarding the results of the new course which the papal policy was taking. In a despatch of 8th August he complained that those who returned after the amnesty, and found their former posts occupied by others, turned their anger against the

¹ Guizot VIII, 344f.

² Minghetti I, 197f.

government, and he was prepared to see them doing their very utmost to get the army and the police, the best safeguards for the maintenance of order, reduced to the least possible dimensions.¹ Metternich himself began to be nervous. In the autumn of 1846 he said to the Sardinian ambassador at Vienna, that Austria had been prepared for everything but a Liberal pope. Such they now had, therefore he could no longer guarantee anything.²

Nor was it long before the inhabitants of the Papal States discovered that the new era could not free them from all misfortunes. On 14th August a serious earthquake was felt at Leghorn and Pisa, the effects of which reached the Papal States also, where, beside other places, two small towns near Sinigaglia and Rimini were reduced to heaps of ruins. Public safety was again seriously threatened, especially in the Legations. At Bologna there occurred so many assaults, burglaries, and murders, that the citizens found it necessary to maintain armed patrols themselves, who went about the streets.³ The authority of the police was everywhere weakened in the Papal States, and it had not confidence in itself as of old. As early as on 24th August 1846, Gizzi had to issue a circular letter to the papal provincial governors, in which he complained of the constant reports of crimes, bloody quarrels, and thefts in certain provinces. Since the chief reason of these was found to lie in the idleness of the young men, the Pope had resolved to open an institution in Rome, where unsettled young Italians might under good influence be taught a craft, or be drilled to be soldiers and non-commissioned officers. After having represented this as a new proof of the interest His Holiness took in the welfare of his subjects, Gizzi added an official repudiation of Neo-Guelphism. "The Holy Father, however," he writes, "does not intend to promote the welfare of his subjects by adopting certain theories, which in their nature can never be applied to the peculiar position of the Papal States, nor will he countenance certain tendencies, which are quite foreign to him. These theories and tendencies have been rejected by many wise men, and

¹ Helfert, 89.

² M. Tabarrini: *Il Papa Pio IX.* in the *Nuova Antologia* for 15th February 1878, II.

³ Minghetti I, 210.

they would certainly threaten both the outward and the inward peace, which is needful for every government, which wishes to promote the welfare of its subjects."¹

The intended institution for neglected young people was opened under the name of *La pia opera di S. Raffaele*, and in Don Carlo Torlonia, a brother of the well-known banker, this Rescue Home obtained a self-sacrificing head. Besides this, Gizzi at once convened the so-called *Congregazione degli Studii*, which was under the leadership of Mezzofanti, and by its help a good deal was done to counteract the ignorance in which so many of the inhabitants of the Papal States grew up. Furthermore, the project of making railways was taken up. Pius IX. did not say, as did his predecessor, *chemin de fer chemin d'enfer*; and in spite of his great respect for Pius VII. he had the clock on Monte Cavallo arranged to show "French time" (twice twelve hours in the day and night), as it had shown during the French period, until Pius VII. in 1814 re-introduced the old division of the clock dial.

These little improvements and changes were heralded as important reforms, and they gave the citizens of Rome welcome opportunities of intoxicating themselves with sweet wine and proud dreams of the future. Numerous books, both poetry and prose, were published to announce to contemporaries and to posterity the new Pope's great and good deeds, and the splendid fêtes which took place in the Eternal City.² Cesare Balbo foresaw that serious dangers might arise if these daily manifestations of joy in public places were to continue, and he uttered warnings against them; but his Cassandra voice was immediately drowned by the jubilation of the people.³ Count Rossi perceived another danger; the popularity so easily attained might go to the head of Pius IX., so that he might too soon think his work ended and go to sleep on popular favour as on "a bed of roses."⁴ Pius IX.'s good friends had other anxieties; they feared lest the loud shouts of delight might stir up the enemies of the Papacy to violence. One day the Capucin General, Cardinal Micara,

¹ Printed in Italian in the *Augsb. Allgemeine Zeitung* for 6th September 1846; in German in the appendix to the number for 14th September.

² Spada: *Storia della rivoluzione di Roma* I, 153f., where not less than fifty-eight eulogies are chronicled, all of the year 1846.

³ Reuchlin I, 295.

⁴ Guizot VIII, 349.

entered the Pope's room to offer him a present. Pius IX. declared that he never accepted any presents from the clergy, but Micara assured him that he would certainly accept this one when he had seen it. He then opened the door and introduced three brawny Capucins to the astonished Pope, who were, according to the General, the most trustworthy in the whole order; one was to be the Pope's cook, another his valet, the third his doorkeeper. This present was accepted with a smile.¹

On the 8th September, Rome was again in festive mood. It was the birthday of the Madonna, and Pius IX. wished to worship in the church of Santa Maria del Popolo. On the Piazza del Popolo a splendid triumphal arch was erected with a boastful inscription, and when Pius IX. drove from the church down the Corso the crowds knelt on both sides of his carriage, and from the balconies fell a rain of flowers. In the evening a portion of the town was illuminated, and balloons were sent up at intervals. The chief man at this fête was the sly Trasteverine, Angelo Brunetti, generally called Ciceruacchio, in whom some saw *il papalino per eccellenza*, others a genuine type of an old republican.² He developed more and more into a modern Agrippa Menenius, and by a coarse kind of rhetoric had obtained a certain power over the Roman mob, so that at length they looked upon him as the real master of Rome. A little later he published a characteristic letter, which declared in his name "that Angelo Brunetti is, and will continue to be, the friend of the common people, without influence on the police, the Secretaryship of State, or Pius IX.; he only desires to be the friend of all patriots and does not claim the title *Eccellenza* or any other title."³

In the middle of September the learned men of Italy met together at a congress in Genoa.⁴ The foremost of the *scienziati* who attended it was the Prince of Canino, Lucien Bonaparte's eldest son, who was married to a daughter of Joseph Bonaparte. During the papacy of Gregory XVI., the Prince of Canino had been a Conservative of the purest water, he now coquetted actively with Roman Liberalism. He had been received in audience at the Quirinal before he left for Genoa, and Pius IX.

¹ H. Stieglitz, 278.

² Spada I, 68f., and 97f.

³ H. Stieglitz, 314f.

⁴ Minghetti I, 204f. Cappelletti: *Storia di Carlo Alberto*, 301f.

had sent a greeting by him to the Congress, accompanied by a promise of an early restoration of the famous *Accademia dei Lincei*. The Prince of Canino was, however, better known for his untrustworthiness than for his learning—at Rome a palpable lie was called *una caninata*,¹—and the Congress at Genoa occupied itself more with patriotic dreams than with scientific problems. But it was significant that a pope should send his greeting to such a gathering. Pius IX. had not yet given up the faith of the Cardinal of Imola in a harmony between theology and the other sciences.

But he cannot have been wholly free from inward anxieties when he sent the Congress his greeting. While it was sitting, he heard that after the new year a Roman newspaper, *Il Contemporaneo*, would be published, edited by the physician and poet, Pietro Sterbini, one of those to whom amnesty had been granted, and one or two other revolutionaries, who wished to educate the Roman citizens to political Radicalism.² The prospect of such an influence on the Romans made Pius IX. anxious on the subject of the popular delight in demonstrations; and on 8th October a circular letter³ from Gizzi to different magistrates exhorted them to stop the constant gatherings in the streets. The people, as the Secretary of State wrote, must return to their daily occupations and peacefully await the arrangements which the government would make for the welfare of the state.

This monition was not well received, and Pius IX. was himself so accustomed to the echo from the street, that he missed it when it failed him—as it did when on St Charles Borromeo's Day (4th November), on his way to San Carlo in the Corso, he was met with an icy silence. Some days later (9th November), the encyclical *Qui pluribus* was issued, in which the new Pope officially informed the pastors of Roman Catholic Christendom that he had entered upon the heritage of St Peter.⁴ Pius IX. first recalled his predecessor's famous acts, "which are inscribed in the annals of the Church with golden letters"; thereupon, in the same tone as his predecessors, he spoke of the

¹ Helfert, 100.

² Spada, 99. The first number published 2nd January 1847 was immediately seized. Spada, 178f.

³ Copied in Spada I, 102f.

⁴ *Lettres apostoliques de Pie IX.*, etc., 177f.

enemies of the Church, the secret associations, the Bible Societies, public indifference, godless philosophy, communism, and the evil Press. It was altogether the spirit of Gregory XVI. which found expression in this encyclical, and it was quite in accordance with this that rumour affirmed it to have been composed by Lambruschini, and that Gizzi had not seen it in its entirety until it was in print.¹ When Count Lützow returned to Rome at the end of December, after an absence of some little duration, he was astonished at the great change that had taken place in the temper of the Romans. It became more and more clear to him that the revolutionary propaganda had made many conquests during the hours of popular delirium, and he saw that there was an invisible power, which commanded, and which was obeyed, but which gave its command with the utmost caprice. A little later, however, he thought he might reassure Metternich by saying that Pius IX. was not himself a Utopian, and that the Liberal Pope, as the head of the visible Church, only thought of promoting the happiness of his subjects.² But patience was not the cardinal virtue of the Romans. They designed a caricature, in which Pius IX. was represented as a tortoise. When the Pope saw it he said: "Yes, I move slowly, but I move. Let me be a tortoise so long as I am not a crab."³

The pace of the tortoise, however, was not fast enough for the revolutionaries. Mazzini, who at first, as Minghetti says, had been "disconcerted" (*sbalordito*) at the Liberal behaviour of Pius IX.,⁴ soon learned to make use of this new phase of the Papacy. By means of fêtes, songs, and street demonstrations the people were to be taught what power they possessed, and in that way the revolution was to be prepared for; and a short manual was composed to guide the revolutionary propagandists in their agitation.⁵ It emphasised the means by which great and small might best be won for the cause of progress, and in it Mazzini did not even disdain to appeal to "a great philosopher, called Christ, who two thousand years ago preached a brotherhood which the world has not yet seen." The Mazzinians soon discovered how easy it was to feed the

¹ Lützow's despatch in Helfert, 147.

² Helfert, 117.

³ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁴ *Miei Ricordi* I, 225.

⁵ Printed in Spada I, 120f.

impatience of the Romans, so sanguine and politically so incapable; and that the more loudly this impatience was expressed the nearer the day of reckoning would be.

Trained politicians like the papal statesmen were well aware of what was brewing. Several of the Conservative cardinals prophesied that the Liberalism of Pius IX. would end in a catastrophe, and a pamphlet was even issued in which the Liberal Pope was represented as an *intruso*.¹ The Jesuits were busy early and late with their dark prophecies; and they were not to be fooled either by Richard Cobden's fine words, at the banquet which the Romans gave in his honour, or by the envoy from the Sultan of Turkey, who came "like the Queen of Sheba to Solomon" to express the admiration of the Mohammedan sovereign for "the wonderful and exalted actions of Pius IX."² The anxieties of the Conservatives increased in equal degree with the impatience of the Liberals; but the enthusiasm of the lower classes was still as great as ever.

On 15th March 1847 a milder degree of censorship was promulgated, which ordered the institution of a committee of censors, in which, amongst others, the Abate Coppi obtained a seat.³ This administrative act, however, did not satisfy any one. It put difficulties in the way of the moderate papers without putting a stop to the spread of the dangerous secret Press. Professor Orioli and Massimo d'Azeglio tried in vain to appease the general disapproval of this tortoise-measure. Very many agreed with Farini in condemning the preventive censorship, which was guilty of the injustice of imprisoning thought before it had committed any crime whatever. But the people were jubilant even over this small concession, and when Pius IX., ten days later, was present at a church festival in S. Maria sopra Minerva, the crowd of people shouted to him: *Coraggio, Santo Padre!*

The same acclamation had been heard already from France, where Thiers, on 4th February, from the tribune in the Chamber of Deputies, had exclaimed with the sympathy of the French Liberals: *Courage, Saint Père!* And such encouragements did not fail in their effect upon the impressionable Pope. At the end of March he summoned his friend,

¹ Helfert, 105.

² Spada I, 179 and 183.

³ Farini I, 183f. Spada I, 193f.

Giuseppe Pasolini, from Imola to Rome to discuss with him the establishment of a sort of consultative assembly (*Consulta di Stato*);¹ and on 19th April Gizzi sent to the legates and delegates of the provinces a communication to the effect that such a *Consulta* would be formed. Each of the highest officials in the Papal States was to propose three persons, and of these the Pope would select one for each province to be a member of the *Consulta*, which was to meet at Rome to give the government good advice.² This measure was greeted with the greatest joy as an introduction to greater and more extensive concessions in a Liberal direction. The crowds gathered again on Monte Cavallo with banners and torches, and when a pigeon flew over the Piazza while Pius IX. was blessing the people, one whispered to another: *Lo Spirito Santo*.³ The Liberal Pope was to many simple-minded folks *l'uomo del miracolo*.

Some weeks afterwards, Vincenzo Gioberti's book, *Il Gesuita Moderno*, set Roman society ablaze. At first the sale of the book was prohibited; afterwards the sale was only allowed with certain precautions which could easily be evaded. The position of the Jesuits in Rome had, perhaps, never before been so unfortunate. Nobody dared to defend them; everybody attacked them.⁴ Even Gizzi considered that Gioberti's intentions were good, but he felt obliged to censure certain expressions which seemed to smack of indifferentism, and to undervalue the rights of the Holy See. Accordingly, the Archbishop of Cambrai, Cardinal Giraud, was commissioned to request the author to expunge from the book the blemishes mentioned, so that Rome might not be obliged to prohibit it. But Gioberti answered proudly that it would be better to say of him: *laudabiliter obmutuit* than *laudabiliter se subjecit*.⁵ His book was therefore prohibited, but not until it had contributed greatly to inflame hatred for the order of Loyola; even those who were not blind to its weaknesses could not resist its eloquence.⁶

¹ Pasolini: *Memorie*, 65f.

² Spada I, 198f.

³ Pasolini, 67.

⁴ Cp. Fr. Janssen's letter in Maynard: *J. Crétineau-Joly*, 243.

⁵ Reusch: *Index* II, 1137.

⁶ Minghetti, who blames its *prolissità strabocchevole e minusie infinite*, values it so

On 11th June Pius IX. held a consistory at which Giacomo Antonelli, amongst others, received the cardinal's hat, and in the period that immediately followed this remarkable man came more to the front.

He belonged to an old robber family at Sonnino.¹ His father, Domenico Antonelli, lived for some time at Terracina, where, by various undertakings, he amassed a considerable fortune. His mother, Felicità Mancini, was famous for her classic beauty; by that, and by her country costume, she attracted much notice when she came to Rome to visit her son who was being educated there. The young Antonelli was a true Hernician; his swift walk, keen eye, pointed nose, and big mouth revealed that he was of that race. He had not much knowledge, but was quick, and understood how to learn of all, and to master whatever might be of use to him. His supple nature, which could by turns adapt itself to the ways of piety, or of worldly wisdom, made a sympathetic impression, both on the friends of the Church and on the worldly-minded. In 1834, he became assessor in the criminal court, and he sometimes acted as president when the proper president, the Governor of Rome, was absent. After eighteen months' work in this court, he was appointed apostolic delegate, first at Orvieto, afterwards at Viterbo and Macerata; but in the provinces people disapproved both of his fanatical "Gregorianism," and of his weakness for women. When he returned to Rome he became Under-Secretary of State in the Home Office, and afterwards administrator of the Papal finances (*tesoriere generale*).

Antonelli, under Pius IX., was considered a moderate Liberal;² it did not, therefore, excite much surprise that he obtained a seat in the council of ministers, which by Metternich's advice,³ was finally formed by a *Motu proprio* of 12th July. Two days afterwards, the list of members of the Ministry was published: Gizzi was president of the council, secretary both for the Home Department, and for Foreign Affairs; Cardinal Riario Sforza, Minister of Industry and Commerce; Cardinal

highly that he thinks there are pages in it without match in Italian literature, and even in the literature of any other country. *Miei Ricordi* I, 278.

¹ Silvagni III, 668f.

² *Ibid.*, 676.

³ *Nachgelassene Papiere* VII, 248f.

Massimo, Minister of Public Works; Mgr. de Medici-Spada, Minister of War; Mgr. Grassellini, the Governor of Rome, Director of the Police; Mgr. Roberti, Minister of Justice; and Antonelli, Minister of Finance.

A few days after the appointment of the council, the Romans were to celebrate the anniversary of the accession of Pius IX., and the rejoicing was then at its highest; but even at that moment, the revolutionary undercurrent was strongly felt amidst the enthusiasm for the Liberal Pope.¹ From the Forum, with its ancient memories of the Republic, a long procession wound through the streets of Rome. "Ciceruacchio" carried a banner, on which was written: *Amnestia, Codici, Strade ferrate, Municipi, Deputati, Istruzione*, in thanks for what had been gained, but also as a reminder of what must follow. For the first time was heard the Roman *Marseillaise*, Pietro Sterbini's famous song:

"Scuoti, o Roma, la polvere indegna,
Cingi il capo d'alloro e d'olivo,
Il tuo canto sia canto giulivo,
Di tua gloria la luce tornò."

In the Baths of Titus there was a banquet at which Sterbini delivered a great speech which ran on into a glorification of old republican Rome and the *popolo-re*, and in Santa Maria degli Angeli, a church festival was celebrated, at which the Barnabite monk, Gavazzi, preached a political sermon, whilst Padre Desanctis performed the liturgical part of the service. It was not long before both these priests turned their backs upon the Roman Church.

From this day the scales began to fall from the eyes of Pius IX.; he saw that for the leaders of the enthusiastic people he was only a symbol of the regeneration of Italy; and this discovery filled him with alarm. On 21st June, the anniversary of his coronation, there were again, of course, festivities at Rome, but on that day the revolutionaries put neither flowers nor candles in their windows, because the festival was not for the Pope as the head of the Church, but as the King of Rome.

¹ Spada I, 228f.

The next day, at the instigation of Austria, Cardinal Gizzi issued an inhibition against public demonstrations. It called forth much exasperation, for these, as we have seen, were a necessary link in the programme of agitation, both of the Mazzinians and of the moderate reform party. It awakened also much ill-feeling when it was reported that on 21st June Pius IX. had visited the Jesuit church of S. Ignazio. A warning was seen posted at the street corners, addressed to "the father of the people, the just and high-minded prince, who is the only one whom the people trust." Anxiety was expressed in it lest "someone or another" should bring Pius IX. to doubt the loyalty of the people.¹ The air was full of rumours; amongst other things it was said that Lambruschini was gaining more and more influence at the Quirinal, and that Austria supported his reactionary suggestions.

The truth in these rumours was that the Austrian government was getting more and more anxious over the march of events at Rome. When the Irish agitator, O'Connell, died there, Padre Ventura delivered a funeral sermon over him in the church of St Andrea della Valle, and in the course of it spoke of despotism as an element of heathenism, and uttered a threat that the clergy would turn towards democracy, and bless it, if the sovereigns of Europe persisted in maintaining the anti-religious despotism of the old barbarian chieftains.² He also spoke of an *entusiasmo dell' amore* which Europe had learned from O'Connell, and of an *agitazione amorosa* which was now being carried on in Italy. Although Pius IX. was innocent in the matter of Ventura's declamations, there were many who thought that the eloquent father was an interpreter of the Pope's thoughts, and Count Lützow and Lambruschini considered such democratic memorial sermons very dangerous. Gizzi also was anxious; and after he had been obliged against his will to issue on 5th July an edict allowing the formation of a civic guard (*guardia civica*) at Rome, and on certain conditions in the provinces also,³ he sent in his resignation. He is reported to have said that no cardinal who was *un buon uomo* could get on with Pius IX. for more than six months.

¹ Spada, 239.

² Reusch I, 296.

³ Spada, 244f.

After Gizzi's resignation, the Pope's cousin the Cardinal-Archbishop of Pesaro, Gabriele Ferretti, was called to Rome to undertake the Secretaryship of State. In those ten days (16th to 26th July) which passed between Gizzi's retirement and Ferretti's entrance upon his duties, Rome was literally without a government, and in that short period the revolutionary party made great strides.¹ Pellegrino Rossi describes the new Secretary of State as a courageous and self-sacrificing man, who might be for Pius IX. a sort of Casimir Périer.² He was not, it is true, a great man, but he was penetrated with a sense of the seriousness of the position, sincerely attached to Pius IX., and willing to carry out a Liberal policy. As he had no high opinion of his own ability, he brought with him to Rome his brother, Pietro, who had been involved in the disturbances of 1831, and this naturally caused fresh anxieties to the Gregorians and the Conservative governments.³

Metternich looked upon Gizzi's retirement as a phase in the drama that was being enacted in the Papal States, where the revolution "appeared under the mask of reforms," and he was prepared for a "tragic end."⁴ In February 1847 he had offered France his mediation with England, if the French government would join in exercising a moral pressure on Pius IX. in order to stop his Liberalism;⁵ but France would not agree. Metternich had therefore to be prepared to act on his own behalf, and it is evident from his despatches, and from the diary of the princess, that affairs in Italy caused great uneasiness to his Conservative mind.

Even before Gizzi's withdrawal, when preparations were in progress at Rome for celebrating the anniversary of the decree of amnesty, the rumour of a Sanfedistic conspiracy was circulated.⁶ It was asserted that the Gregorians had threatened the Pope with imprisonment, and the Liberals with death. The truth was that in both camps there were a good many hot-headed persons ready to do anything; and the

¹ O. d'Haussonville II, 217.

² Guizot VIII, 354 and 370.

³ Farini I, 201f., and Spada I, 258f.

⁴ Despatch of 18th July 1847 in *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 409f.

⁵ Bianchi V, 398.

⁶ Farini I, 202f. Guizot VIII, 364f. Spada I, 250f.

hesitation of the government had made the Liberals depressed, and had given the Conservatives courage. The moderate section of the Roman nobility considered that there was serious danger ahead, and they induced the Pope to postpone the contemplated festival. After a sort of proscription list containing the names of "the enemies of the people" had been posted up, the Roman civic guard was armed, and Cardinal Ferretti went round the barracks to encourage those who were to maintain order in the town. It was during one of these visits to the barracks, that he pronounced the celebrated words: "Let us show Europe that we are able to look after ourselves." A few persons were imprisoned, but there was no great outbreak in Rome. Here and there in the provinces, on the other hand, a serious movement was traced.

The Sanfedist party bethought itself of seeking Austrian support, as against the papal government, which was on the most friendly terms with France; and, on 17th July 1847, the Austrians, in accordance with an article in the provisions of the Congress of Vienna, placed troops in the citadel of Ferrara, to the great scandal of the Italian patriots. Massimo d'Azeglio, who immediately left for Pesaro with Tommaso Tommasoni to allay the excitement, spoke no more of moderation, but of firmness, when he had examined the state of things more closely;¹ and the papal government made remonstrances, but in vain. When an Austrian officer, during the night between 1st and 2nd August, was attacked by a mob in the streets of Ferrara on his way home to the citadel, the commandant of the citadel established night patrols to keep guard on the way from the citadel to the barracks, and not the slightest heed was paid to the remonstrances of the papal Cardinal Legate.² During the exchange of notes which followed, it appeared that it was the awakening of national feeling among the Italians which was a thorn in the side of Austria, and the occurrences at Ferrara were meant as a warning to the Liberal Pope, who had dared to make himself the mouth-piece of the national movement. It was reported at Rome

¹ Massimo d'Azeglio: *I miei ricordi* II, 474. *Lettere di M. d'Azeglio a sua moglie Luisa Blondel* (Milano 1870), 156f., and *Lettere inedite di M. d'A. e Filippo Gualterio a Tommaso Tommasoni* (Roma 1885), 130f.

² Metternich: *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 463f.

that Pius IX. had firmly resolved to defy the Austrians, and that he had said: "Out with the Barbarians"; and there were not a few Italians who expected that one day, in the church of St Peter, draped for the occasion in black, he would fulminate against Joseph II.'s ungodly land. Meantime England and France came forward as mediators, and by their exertions an understanding was come to between Austria and Rome, so that the occupation of Ferrara was a threat without immediate consequences.

But Metternich was not at all satisfied. He heard with consternation that daggers were sold in Rome stamped on the hilt with a tiara and with the inscription *Viva Pio nono*, and that it seemed as if people intended to commit murder in the Pope's name; that the Pope's nephew had at a banquet made "a shocking attack" upon the Jesuits, and that it was the cry at Rome: "Down with the Jesuits, the cardinals and the priests."¹ It seemed clear to him that Pius IX. had entered upon a road, that must of necessity lead to a precipice.² He had from the middle of the month of April exchanged a series of notes with Guizot, which show how great an aversion he had to the national movement in Italy, and how little he understood it. The word "Italy," was to him a geographical expression, an empty sound without political value, and it might be dangerous for the Italian states to use it.³ He despised the Neo-Guelphs, those light-minded idealists, who could not discern between good and evil,⁴ and he did not expect anything good from the unpractical Pius IX., with his warm heart and his weak head, and with his Liberal education. He was prepared to see the adherents of moral and material disorder march along decorated with the papal colours, and shouting *Viva Pio nono*!⁵ A Liberal Pope was in his eyes a self-contradiction, and a *Papa del progresso* a comical figure—just as comical, to judge by the result, as the ineffectual *Madonna di riforma*, under whose protection the Neapolitans had revolted in 1820.⁶ But he did not undervalue the difficulties in which

¹ See Metternich VII, 304, 312.

² Metternich, 390.

³ Despatch of 12th April, Metternich, 381. Afterwards he records that Lord Palmerston also called the word "Italy" *un mot vide de sens politique*; see Metternich VII, 412.

⁴ Metternich, 293f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 337f.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 440, 469.

Rome was entangled. "The Papal States must have a theocratic government; but everybody objects to the idea of it. The Roman Church rests on the principle of authority, but the world will have nothing to do with authority of any sort. Religion enjoins equality before God and subjection to authorities, because they proceed from God; but the world will have civil equality and authorities in virtue of the grace of the people."¹ He was fully convinced that the Pope, in order to fulfil his important mission, must be sovereign at Rome; but even if, from one point of view, there lay a strength in the double sovereignty, there was also, from another point of view, a great weakness. "Revolution," says Metternich, "wishes to usurp the temporal sovereignty, and leave the spiritual to its fate."² It is exceedingly dangerous to call up the democratic element, as Pius IX. does, and to promise reforms. Reforms are necessary, but very dangerous; and Pius IX., by the reforms he had hitherto introduced, had destroyed his own temporal power.³ The middle party (*giusto mezzo*), which, Guizot believed to be the winning one in the Papal States, was, according to Metternich's opinion, only to be found in the heads of a few good people whose sole part in the performance was to run about with false information.⁴ What was now happening at Rome might best be designated as a period of experiments, not without danger, as *essais avec des lois*.⁵

On 15th October the members of the promised *Consulta* were elected. Rome received three representatives, Bologna two (one of them was Minghetti), the other Legations one each, so that altogether twenty-three *Consultori* assembled. Cardinal Antonelli was to be the president of the *Consulta*.⁶ On 15th November the assembly was opened with great solemnity. The Roman princes had placed their carriages and servants at the disposal of the representatives, and the members of the *Consulta* drove in a great procession to the Quirinal. A deputy from the town of each of the representatives walked

¹ Metternich, 406. Cp. 428.

² *Ibid.*, 436f.

³ "Le Pape libéral n'est pas un être possible . . . Il peut détruire, mais il ne peut pas édifier. Ce que déjà le Pape libéralisant a détruit, c'est son propre pouvoir temporel; ce qu'il n'a pas le pouvoir de détruire, c'est son pouvoir spirituel:" p. 440.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 342.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 435.

⁶ Pasolini, 69. Spada I, 393f.

in front of his carriage with the city banner.¹ At nine o'clock Cardinal Antonelli introduced the councillors to the Pope, who first said some kind words, expressing good hopes for their work. To these, according to Minghetti, he added, "with a certain warmth that conveyed the impression of dislike,"² a reminder that the assembly was only to be consultative, and he dismissed any idea that it could be otherwise, as quite incompatible with the papal sovereignty. He is even said to have used the word "ingratitude," but it was omitted in the official account in the *Diario di Roma*, and Count Rossi was of opinion that the Pope's pointed words were not really aimed at the councillors themselves, but at some of their companions, "who were well known for their Liberal opinions." His ill-humour, however, created a certain dissatisfaction amongst the councillors, and they parted coldly.

After the audience with Pius IX. the councillors drove to St Peter's, where Mass was said, and thence to the Vatican, where the meetings were to be held. It was immediately proposed to send the Pope an address of thanks, and on the committee that was formed for this purpose Minghetti obtained a seat. The next day the address was agreed to by the assembly, but shortly afterwards they heard that the Pope was not pleased with it, and would not receive it. On 17th November Minghetti was called to the Quirinal, and he then learnt that Pius IX. was displeased because the address contained not merely an expression of thanks, but also a "sort of programme for the government." Pius IX. informed Minghetti that he had by no means bound himself to confirm everything that the councillors were agreed about, and that it was his duty to hand down the rights of the Holy See unimpaired to his successors.³ Three or four days afterwards, however, he declared himself willing to receive the address,⁴ and the *Consulta* commenced its discussions under the able and intelligent guidance of Antonelli.

Metternich was not the only one of the diplomatists interested in Italian politics, who saw that the new *Consulta di Stato* must of necessity be understood as the first step to a representative

¹ Minghetti I, 294f. Cp. also Rossi's despatch in Guizot VIII, 389f.

² Cp. Rossi in Guizot VIII, 391.

³ Minghetti I, 296f.

⁴ It is copied in Minghetti I, 301f.

assembly, which according to his opinion could neither be reconciled with the sovereignty of the Pope nor with the ecclesiastical constitutions.¹ After being present at the opening ceremonies, Count Rossi said to one of his friends that he had assisted at the funeral of the temporal power of the Papacy,² and the English ambassador, Lord Minto, drew the same conclusions from this step as Metternich and Rossi.³ But when Lord Minto, at an audience, advised the Pope to rely upon his *Consulta*, the Pope said that Liberal institutions were incompatible with the nature of the Papacy, and the noble lord in vain endeavoured to move Pius IX. to accept such a division between Church and State as existed in his own country, and which in his opinion would furnish the only possible solution of the political difficulty at Rome.

And a solution became every week a more pressing necessity. Mazzini, then staying in London, sent from thence on 8th November an open letter to Pius IX., in which he appealed to the Pope to place himself at the head of the national movement in Italy, while at the same time he informed him that the Italians would tear themselves away from the cross and go their own way if he did not follow this advice.⁴ Mazzini's letter is marked throughout by that "faith" in a God and in the unity of Italy, which composed the private religion of this agitator; but it also contained many expressions which were bound to scandalise a faithful Catholic, not to speak of a Pope. Metternich called it "the most foolhardy attack, which any mortal had hitherto made on the head of the Catholic Church in his capacity alike of Pope and of sovereign";⁵ and in an allocution on 17th December Pius IX., with deep emotion, repudiated such an appeal from a man who had long ago sung the dirge of the Papacy.

At the beginning of 1848 Guizot also received an open letter from Mazzini, in which he asserted that the often-mentioned

¹ Metternich VII, 436.

² Ch. de Mazade: *Pellegrino Rossi, l'Italie et la Papauté* in the *Revue des deux mondes* 1861, 742. Cp. the despatch in Guizot VIII, 389f.

³ Despatch to Palmerston of 28th January 1848: Bianchi V, 84. As to the Pope's sympathies for Lord Minto, see the *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung*, 1847, 2876 (a letter of 16th December).

⁴ Mazzini: *Scritti* VI, 156f.

⁵ *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 557f.

moderate Neo-Guelph party had more and more disappeared from the scene. "There are," Mazzini wrote, "a number of men who are willing to die for the unity of the Italian people, but there is not one who will sacrifice himself for the theories of Signor Balbo."¹ This was a clear statement, and the circumstances seemed to prove that Mazzini was right. By the side of the moderate *Circolo Romano*, which was at first presided over by Prince Aldobrandini (Camillo Borghese), and afterwards by the Duke of Sermoneta and the Duke of Lante di Montefeltro,² a very Radical club, the *Circolo Popolare*, had been formed.³ At first the government thought the Liberals would be weakened by a division into two groups, but the hesitations of the Pope, the perseverance of the Radical agitation, and the force of circumstances, drove more and more people over to the *Circolo Popolare*, so that it became evident to everybody that Mazzini's ideas had entirely vanquished those of Gioberti and Balbo. Metternich had for a long time been convinced that the Papacy was sliding towards a precipice, and in the New Year's letter, which he sent on 2nd January to the Austrian ambassador at Rome, he expressed anew his anxieties, and also his firm assurance that the whole movement for liberty had its root in the sixteenth century reformation. "From the reformation in the sixteenth century," he wrote, "it was only one step to the social revolution; now again it will be only one step from a reform in the government to a reform in the Catholic Church itself."⁴

On the 29th December 1847, Pius IX. had made another sacrifice to the Liberal wishes of his subjects. He had issued a *Motu proprio*, which made the ministers responsible for their government, and granted laymen access to several ministerial offices, not, however, to the Secretaryship of State, or to the Foreign Office, which was united with it. Fresh outbursts of rejoicing had rewarded this concession; but many became anxious when they heard the now common exclamation *Viva Pio IX. solo!*⁵ and even at the New Year several incidents

¹ Guizot VIII, 372f.

² Spada I, 284f. Silvagni III, 690f.

³ Spada I, 297f. Farini I, 275.

⁴ *Nachgel. Papiere* VII, 569.

⁵ Pasolini, 71.

pointed to a coming breach between the Pope and the Romans. On New Year's Eve the people gathered in the Piazza del Popolo, to proceed from thence to the Quirinal with torches and banners to wish the Pope a happy New Year. While the procession was being arranged, a message was brought that the Quirinal was surrounded by troops, and that the Pope would not show himself to the people. This message awakened the fury of the crowd, and many hard words were uttered about the successor of St Peter. The aged Prince Corsini, Senator of Rome, the president of the Municipal Council which had been solemnly inaugurated on the 24th November, went to the Quirinal, and succeeded in extorting from the Pope the promise that he would show himself to the people the next day. Upon Cardinal Ferretti and the Director of the Police was laid the blame for the measure which awakened the anger of the people, and on the following day the Pope drove through the decorated Corso. Ciceruacchio stood on his carriage with a banner which bore the inscription : " Holy Father, trust yourself to the people."

But in spite of this theatrical procession, it was clear to all who had a deeper insight into the circumstances that Pius IX., as Count Rossi said, had thrown away a whole treasure of popularity. The future Cardinal Manning, at that time a priest in the Anglican Church, had on the 11th January a remarkable conversation with Padre Ventura, who has been already mentioned. Ventura was the favourite of the people, because he was such a good democrat. The popular Theatine declared openly that Pius IX., in the last few months, had lost three-fifths of his favour with the people, and that the rest was likely to vanish in the course of the month that was coming. Padre Ventura expressed himself likewise with much bitterness about " the obscurantists " who, in his opinion, often had in fact as little religion as the extreme Radicals ; and they were at that time doing all that they could to separate the people from the Pope. He related that not long before, during an audience, he had suggested to Pius IX. that he should introduce freedom of the Press, and grant liberty of conscience to all the inhabitants of the Papal States by revoking the obligation to attend confession and communion at Easter (*obbligo della pasqua*). The Pope had

been much disquieted by this proposal, and had exclaimed: "I have done enough; I will do no more." But the next day he had said to Antonelli that the conversation with Ventura had cost him a sleepless night.¹ The democratic Padre very probably caused Pius IX. several more such nights; for he went further and further. A few months later he wrote to Gioberti: "I believe Europe has done with monarchy in all its forms, and that at the latest by the next jubilee year (1875 or 1900), there will be no more kings. But in the meantime it is necessary to liberate the Church entirely from the State, and to take education out of the hands of the temporal power. I will never believe that a state is truly free so long as it has a ministry of public worship, and an education department; these are matters that lie outside the province of government, and when it interferes in them it leads to despotism."²

As soon as the news reached Rome that a revolution had broken out at Palermo—above all when it was made known that Ferdinand II. had given the Neapolitans a constitution—the population of Rome was greatly stirred. The *conservatori*, headed by Prince Corsini, called upon the Romans to express their satisfaction at the new Neapolitan constitution *con una generale illuminazione* on 3rd February, and the appeal was willingly responded to. The tricolour was planted beside the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius on the Capitol, and on this festive occasion many Romans wore the three-coloured cockade—a sign that the revolution was nearing Rome itself.³ Before this festival Cardinal Ferretti had already retired from the Secretaryship of State, in which he was followed by another cardinal, Giuseppe Bofondi, who took his seat in the Ministerial Council for the first time on 1st February. This change of *personnel* was of no importance; the cry of the people was now: *Abbasso i ministri sacerdoti!* They would now be contented with nothing but a ministry of laymen.⁴

On 10th February Pius IX. in some measure gave in to

¹ E. S. Purcell: *Life of Cardinal Manning* (London 1895) I, 367f.

² Kraus in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1888, Vol. LV, 66, following Massari: *Ricordi biogr. e carteggio di V. Gioberti* III, 80f.

³ Spada II, 30f.

⁴ Cp. the *Proclama del popolo*, printed in Spada II, 37f.

this demand by issuing a *Motu proprio*, which promised to increase the number of laymen in the ministry, and to take a fatherly interest in everything which might further the peace and quietude of the State. The papal missive ended with a prayer that God would bless Italy, and preserve the people's most precious possession—the faith.¹ On the day following, the people collected before the Quirinal to express their gratitude, and Pius IX. appeared on the balcony, and repeated: *Benedite, gran Dio, l'Italia!* Minghetti, who was present, together with Count Rossi, relates that the Pope's blessing made a strong impression upon all; but this soon vanished. Shouts were raised for a constitution; and when Pius IX. heard them, he said with a certain vehemence: "Do not come with requests, which I cannot, ought not, and do not mean to, grant." Rossi whispered to Minghetti: "The Pope has had recourse to heroic measures. This time he has been heard to the end, but woe to him, if he once more undertakes to address the people."²

More and more constitutions were granted in Italy. Even Charles Albert and the Grand-Duke of Tuscany had to promise their subjects free constitutions, and the Romans rejoiced over the rising sun of liberty, and hoped that soon they would themselves be able fully to enjoy its rays. At present they had to be content with the admission of Pasolini and a couple of other laymen to the ministry, and the appointment of a commission of cardinals and prelates, to consider how far a free constitution would be compatible with the nature of the papal government.³

Before the deliberations of the commission were at an end the news of the revolution of February reached Rome. The first effect of it upon Pius IX. was that of relief. He felt that the upheaval at Paris proved that he himself had done right in entering upon the path of reform, and he flattered himself that by that means he had kept the revolution away from Rome. All Louis Philippe's offences against the Church rose before him, and he entertained the sanguine hope that the Republic would pay more attention to the rights of the Church than the Citizen King had done.⁴ He was moved to tears, when he

¹ Spada II, 41f.

² Minghetti I, 327. Cp. Spada II, 47.

³ Farini I, 339f. Pasolini, 77f.

⁴ Minghetti, 329.

heard that an excited crowd at Paris had knelt before a crucifix that was carried past, and his hesitation with regard to a constitution suddenly disappeared. But he held firmly to one thing. Such a constitution must be drafted entirely by ecclesiastics. The least interference on the part of laymen would violate its purity, and render his own voluntariness in the matter doubtful.

The first thing was to form the *ministero laico*, which the people had so loudly demanded. On 11th March the official *Gazzetta di Roma* contained the names of the new ministry. Cardinal Antonelli was to be president. He was only a sub-deacon, and never became anything more. Pasolini retained his post as Minister of Commerce; Prince Aldobrandini became Minister of War; the young Marco Minghetti, Minister of Public Works; Galletti, Chief of Police; Sturbinetti, Minister of Justice; Mgr. Morichini, Minister of Finance; and Cardinal Mezzofanti, Minister of Education. Thus the great majority of the ministers were laymen.¹

The new ministers commenced their business by asking the Pope to give the promised Constitution. The document² was signed by everybody, except Galletti, who had not yet reached Rome, and Mezzofanti, who, under the pretext of being ill, kept away from all the meetings of the new ministry, because, as Minghetti says, he was of a timid character, and at the bottom of his heart was unfavourably disposed towards everything new. On 14th March the expected *statuto fondamentale* was at last published.³ According to this fundamental law the Papal States were hereafter to have the system of two chambers—an Upper Chamber (*Alto Consiglio*), chosen by the Pope, and a Chamber of Deputies, elected by the people. The College of Cardinals was to be over the two chambers, and it had the right, after deliberating with closed doors, to veto or to sanction the laws passed by Parliament. Parliament was forbidden to discuss bills concerning purely ecclesiastical or mixed questions (*affari ecclesiastici o misti*), or which were at variance with the laws and discipline of the Church. Nor might it attempt to alter the

¹ On the composition of the ministry see Pasolini, 83f. and Minghetti I, 331f.

² Printed in Minghetti I, 338f.

³ Printed in Farini I, 349f.

fundamental law, or to discuss the diplomatic and religious relations of the Holy See to foreign states.

The new Constitution was received both at Rome and in the provinces with gratitude and rejoicing,¹ although in fact it granted but a small measure of liberty. For what could not, according to Roman Catholic ideas, be reckoned amongst the "mixed affairs" which were to be withdrawn from the discussion of Parliament? And what a drag upon the wheel could not the veto of the cardinals be! The national feeling, however, at that period was stronger than the longing for liberty, especially in Rome, where the cry was constantly heard: "Out with the barbarians!" The revolutions at Vienna, Milan, and Venice, which followed, one after the other, upon the revolution of February, made the Romans think that the moment had come for throwing off the Austrian yoke. The church bells tolled the Empire to its grave, and the people burned the Austrian coat-of-arms on the Piazza del Popolo. The embitterment of the people was directed also against the Jesuits, because they were friends of the Austrian policy and of the old *régime*; and the ministry advised them to give in to the force of circumstances and leave the city. As even Antonelli recommended this measure,² the disciples of Loyola gave way. On 28th March Father Roothaan left Rome,³ and on the following day Manning saw the Jesuits wander through the house of their profession, the sacristy, and the Gesù, to take leave of the beloved places; and all was desolate and deserted by the altars of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier. Father Roothaan took up his abode at Marseilles, where he could be in easy communication with Italy, and on Ascension Day he consoled those under him with a circular, which exhorted them to show the greatest reverence for the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus.⁴ The proceedings against the Jesuits were, according to Minghetti, a hard blow to the sensitive heart of Pius IX., and the results were fateful. He could not forget the injustice, which, in his opinion, had been done to the Society of Jesus, and in order to compensate them for that injustice he afterwards favoured the disciples of Loyola above all the other orders.

¹ Farini's letter to Minghetti in Minghetti I, 399.

² Minghetti I, 353f.

³ Alberdingk Thijm, 127.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 165f.

But for the moment he had something else to think of. On learning that the revolution at Parma and Piacenza paid no heed whatever to the old claims of the Papal See upon those territories, he was alarmed and began to suspect a coming tempest.¹ But when he heard that ecclesiastics, amidst the wildest uproar, had been respectfully saluted in many places; when he remembered that the exiled French king was a son of the Philippe "Egalité" of the Revolution; and that the fallen *régime* in Austria had sought support in the ungodly laws of Joseph II., he was inclined to allow himself to be entirely carried away by the national movement. In a proclamation of the 30th March he declared that recent events were not the handiwork of man. "Woe to him, who cannot hear the voice of the Lord in the wind that now roars through the cedars and the oaks, and cleaves and breaks them." The Pope cannot be silent, when his children's souls are moved by wishes and aspirations, and he prays for the Italy, which he does not indeed love more than all other lands—for he is bound to love all Catholic Christendom—but which is nearest to him.²

Once more, for a short time, the watchword was: "Religion, liberty, Italy!" and Pius IX. is said to have contemplated anointing Charles Albert as King of Northern Italy, if he returned victorious from Lombardy. But the pious Pope was more and more pained at the thought of being the successor of the Prince of peace, and yet having to send his troops out to defend the frontiers. He blessed the soldiers, when they marched away headed by the cross and the tricolour, but there was not one drop of Julius II.'s *condottiere* blood in him. When General Durando issued from Bologna a proclamation to the soldiers,³ composed by Massimo d'Azeglio,⁴ in which the impending war was called not only national, but also supremely Christian, and when Durando gave the army the old watchword of the crusaders, *Iddio lo vuole*, Pius IX. was seized with the greatest horror, for it was as much as to make him responsible for the war. It was necessary to prevent such a misunderstanding, and it was with great difficulty that the ministers succeeded

¹ Minghetti I, 347f.

² Farini II, 19f.

³ Printed in Minghetti I, 365f.

⁴ *Nel quale ei pose la vivacità di poeta più che la saviezza di uomo di Stato*, Minghetti says rightly of it.

in getting him to be content with declaring in the *Gazetta ufficiale*, that "the Pope, when he wishes to express his opinion, always speaks *ex se*, and never through the mouth of a subordinate."

Nevertheless, on 18th April General Durando obtained permission to commence hostilities, and three days later he crossed the river Po.¹ The die was thus cast, but Pius IX. was more uneasy than ever. Events at Rome created indignation in many places in the Roman Catholic world. The Princess Metternich, who, on the outbreak of the revolution at Vienna, had fled to Holland with her husband, wrote in her diary: "The Pope blesses the troops that are to conquer our provinces! Good God! Is every sentiment of justice and honour extinguished?"² And the papal nuncio reported that everywhere in Germany people were displeased at the action of Rome against a German sovereign. Pius IX. then perceived that he had gone too far. The Conservative cardinals confirmed him in this opinion, and represented to him that his attitude towards Austria had extinguished every hope of a Concordat which might do away with the results of the ungodly policy of Joseph II. In his despair Pius IX. turned his back upon vain politics, and shut himself up all day with the Grand Penitentiary to discuss certain "reserved cases" that were referred on appeal to the see of St Peter. Minghetti records that he and his colleagues in the ministry might in vain apply for an audience, to ascertain the Pope's opinion about questions of the utmost urgency, while Pius IX. and the Grand Penitentiary were discussing a matter concerning a monk or nun on the other side of the Atlantic.³ It was quite intelligible, when the Emperor Nicholas's ambassador, Count Butenjeff, who was to treat with Rome about the position of the Catholics in Poland and Russia, said, on seeing Pius IX. behave in such a manner, "He is an honest priest, but nothing more."⁴

The ministers of the unhappy Pope, under such circumstances, were greatly confirmed in their doubts as to the compatibility of the headship of the Church with temporal sovereignty.⁵ It was

¹ Aldobrandini's despatch to Durando in Bianchi V, 185f.

² Metternich VIII, 15.

³ Minghetti I, 349f.

⁴ Bianchi V, 196.

⁵ Minghetti I, 372.

impossible for them to induce the Pope to take a decisive step. On 25th April the whole ministry sent him a letter,¹ in which they represented to him that he must either agree to his subjects making war, or positively declare that he would not have war, or say that although he wished for peace, he was unable to prevent the outbreak of war. All the ministers, and, according to Pasolini, none of them more than Cardinal Antonelli, were convinced that the war was a necessity and the least evil; but they could not prevail on their sovereign to arrive at a conclusion. When they urged him, he referred them to an allocution which he intended soon to make to the cardinals. "A strange position for a constitutional ministry," Minghetti rightly remarks, "to be ignorant whether the sovereign will declare war or not."²

The 29th April dawned at last, the day on which Pius IX. was to make the expected allocution to the College of Cardinals. The Austrian ambassador is reported to have said to Count Butenjeff concerning the allocution: "We drew it up!" This is very probable.³ When the ministers read it in the *Gazzetta di Roma*, they found, as Minghetti says, "that it was an expression of the victory of reactionary and clerical Europe over Italy and Liberalism,"⁴ and they sent in their resignation at once. But the next morning Pius IX. sent for them, and reproached them for having wished to depart. He represented to them, that he, as Pope, was bound to disapprove of the war, since he must needs entertain fatherly feelings towards all Catholic people, but that the ministers could not, of course, be held responsible for an allocution with which they had had nothing to do.⁵ As they held to their resignation, Pius IX. called in Cardinal Ferretti, and it was expected that he would form the new ministry. Until it was formed the ministers remained at the Quirinal—to the relief of Cardinal Antonelli. For the Prime Minister, who was not at all liked, and who had his residence in the Quirinal, deemed himself thus safe against attacks from the mob. The Cardinal shortened the painful time of waiting for his former colleagues by showing them his collections, and he was

¹ Pasolini, 97f.

² Minghetti I, 372. Cp. Pasolini, 101.

³ Pasolini, 101, according to Dr Pantaleoni who was doctor to the Russian embassy.

⁴ It is found in Italian in Spada II, 248f.

⁵ Minghetti I, 376.

apparently in full accord with them in political matters. But Minghetti had already grave doubts as to his trustworthiness; and later events proved that he was right. While Minghetti retained only pleasant recollections of Pius IX., he came to look upon Antonelli as a crafty person (*un uomo scaltro*), possessed neither of great thoughts nor of high feelings. After the part he had played in the constitutional and national movement, it might have been expected that he would afterwards have kept in the background, when the reaction was in full swing. But instead of this, he became foremost amongst the men of the reaction, and he saw his old comrades traduced and persecuted without giving them a thought. If he had but possessed the ardent faith of Pius IX., his behaviour might have been explained, but Minghetti was convinced that he was more of a sceptic than anything else, and was far removed from all mystical enthusiasm.¹

Pasolini had an equally unfavourable impression of Antonelli. To him also the cardinal loudly expressed his sorrow over his disappointed hopes, and exclaimed: "You lay ministers are happy that you can take your own course. My cloth forbids me that. But Pius IX. shall never again get me to enter his service. What he commands me, as Pope, I must perform on account of my ecclesiastical oath; but when he speaks as a sovereign—no, he shall never again get hold of me."²

During the ministerial crisis the ferment increased at Rome, and the civic guard stood under arms to keep the peace. The castle of S. Angelo was occupied, and guards were placed in front of several of the cardinals' palaces. Crowds paraded the streets and shouted: *Non più preti!* and demanded that Count Terenzio Mamiani should be minister. It took some time before it was clear to everybody what the last allocution to the cardinals meant; but when it was understood, Pius IX. endeavoured in vain to efface the impression it made by a placard in the streets of Rome, in which he reproachfully asked, "My people, what have I done against you?"³

It soon became evident to Cardinal Ferretti that he was not the right man for the present situation, and there was there-

¹ Minghetti I, 38of.

² Pasolini, 106.

³ Spada II, 246f.

fore nothing else for the Pope to do but to send for Count Mamiani. On 2nd May he undertook to form a new government, and thereby Antonelli's ministry was formally dissolved.¹

The Roman senate met the next day to vote an address to Pius IX., in which they expressed their regret that the language in the fatal allocution, by which the Pope repudiated the accusation of being the author of the national movement in Italy, might be understood to mean that he intended now to abandon the national cause and to declare the Italian war unjustified.² To prevent such a view being taken, Pius IX. sent a humble letter the same day to the Austrian emperor, in which he appealed to him to abandon the war and to endeavour instead to win the hearts of the Lombards and the Venetians, so that the German and Italian nations might be as sisters, living in peaceful understanding within their natural borders.³ When this letter was published some weeks afterwards, it was not badly received in Rome, but it was insufficient to pacify people's minds.⁴

On the evening of 3rd May the new ministry was formed in the Palazzo Doria, the owner of which, Prince Filippo Doria Pamfili, was to be Secretary of State for War. The president of the ministry was to be Cardinal Orioli, until Cardinal Ciacchi could take the post; but to the general mind the new government was a Mamiani ministry.⁵

Count Terenzio Mamiani della Rovere, who was born in 1800 at Pesaro, was well known as a zealous supporter of the movement for liberty. On account of his participation in the disturbances of 1831, he had been obliged to seek refuge in exile. He took up his abode in France, where he continued his philosophical studies,⁶ but he maintained connexion with the national party in Italy, and Gioberti praised him in high terms in his *Del Primato* as thinker, poet, and patriot. When amnesty was granted to the restless spirits of 1831, Mamiani was

¹ Minghetti I, 375.

² Spada II, 272f.

³ The letter in Spada II, 276f.

⁴ Spada II, 289, 320f.

⁵ It appears also from the address of the civic guard to Mamiani as "presidente del consiglio dei ministri."—Spada II, 284f.

⁶ About his importance as a philosopher see A. Angelini: *Di Terenzio Mamiani filosofo* (Roma 1886). Several of his writings were placed on the Index. Reusch: *Index* II, 1041.

one of the thirty-three who were excluded from it, and during the *régime* of Cardinal Gizzi he attempted in vain to obtain permission to return to Italy, for he could not make up his mind to subscribe to the necessary declaration. But Cardinal Ferretti succeeded in procuring an amnesty for him, and as a token of his gratitude the Count wrote a letter from Genoa to the papal Secretary of State, in which he solemnly promised to respect the existing laws, and to keep aloof from every secret or violent attempt to alter the political situation.¹

When Mamiani returned to Rome in September 1847 he was entertained by the *Circolo Romano* at a public banquet; and after the fundamental law had been promulgated on 14th March 1848, he began to publish the paper *L'Epoca*, by means of which he quickly gained a prominent position amongst the Roman Liberals. Pius IX. had no sympathy with him whatever. The Pope said of the philosophical count that if all the bad things that were said of the Jesuits and Jesuitism were true, the quintessence of Jesuitism would be found in Count Mamiani.² Mamiani wished to separate the temporal power from the ecclesiastical, and to surrender the former to laymen, in order to preserve the latter for St Peter's successor. The Pope ought, in his opinion, to live "in the undisturbed peace of Christian doctrine," and leave Parliament to take care of the temporal welfare of the country; and there was in his personal behaviour a want of consideration which offended Pius IX. He therefore became, as Farini says, Pius IX.'s minister, without being his counsellor. The papal nuncios in foreign parts would have nothing to do with the ultra-Liberal ministry, and the foreign reactionary Courts refused to treat with the foreign secretary, Count Marchetti, the first layman to fill that post.

A few weeks after the formation of the Mamiani ministry, Gioberti came to Rome. The last papal allocution had made him, like others, uneasy; he perceived in it evidence that Pius IX. intended to abandon the regeneration of Italy. He now came to Rome either to win over the Pope once more to the cause of Italy, or to proclaim Charles Albert King of Rome. The Liberal inhabitants of Rome greeted him with

¹ Spada II, 297f. The letter in Mamiani: *Scritti politici* (Firenze 1853), 51.

² A. von Reumont: *Aus König Fr. Wilhelms IV. gesunden und kranken Tagen*,

Viva Gioberti, as he passed down the Corso, and the common people did him honour in every way. Pius IX. embraced him when he received him, and rejoiced to have had "the father of the fatherland" as his guest.¹ And Gioberti summoned up all his flowery eloquence in order to get the Pope away from Austria and absolutism. According to his own opinion, he was quite successful in his task; and when he returned to his hotel in the evening after the audience, he delivered a high-flown oration, in which he assured the multitude, which collected under his balcony, that Pius IX. would bring about the independence of Italy, as surely as he himself had given the first impetus to it; and he declared that there was no Italian prince who could be compared to "the divine Pius IX." He concluded his speech with a *Viva* for the great Pope, the regenerator of Italy.²

After having had two or three more audiences Gioberti left Rome perfectly satisfied, and at Perugia he met with the Bishop, Gioacchino Pecci (afterwards Leo XIII.), who shortly after sent him a letter full of gratitude and admiration. But not a year had passed before two archbishops published a letter, in which they besought Pius IX. to condemn all Gioberti's works, "because he assailed not only the highly deserving Society of Jesus, but all Christian truths." And the condemnation came in 1852, after Padre Tonnini had delivered an opinion which ended by calling "the father of his fatherland" *in philosophia parvus, in theologia nullus, in religione impius*.³ But by that time Gioberti had long entered upon a political course which obtained for him for a while a seat in the ministry at Turin.

The poetical politician had understood how to make an impression on the susceptible Pope; but Pius IX.'s reawakened enthusiasm for Neo-Guelphism was only a passing sentiment. When the unrest at Rome increased, he felt himself constrained to threaten his subjects with making use of a spiritual weapon "of which he knew the strength." Nevertheless, it was reported at Rome that he had promised to set the Iron Crown upon Charles Albert's head at Milan;⁴ but at the same time people

¹ Kraus in the *Deutsche Rundschau* 1888, Vol. LV, 67f.

² Spada II, 317.

³ Reusch: *Index* II, 1138.

⁴ Purcell: *Cardinal Manning* I, 409.

were deeply offended because he tolerated the Austrian pursuit of the papal volunteers into Romagna. "He threatens us with excommunication," said the Romans, "but our hereditary enemy is allowed to do what he pleases." This was, however, untrue. Pius IX. protested against the proceedings of the Austrians,¹ but his protest was unheeded.

As co-operation with the Mamiani Cabinet was a daily annoyance to Pius IX., he looked about for a successor who might be able to cope with the situation, and his eyes lighted on one of Mamiani's philosophical opponents, a priest who has already been mentioned, Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, of Stresa on the Lago Maggiore, the founder of the *Istituto della Carità*.

This distinguished man had followed the political development with great attention. In 1842 he had written a philosophy of law (*Filosofia di diritto della politica*), and in 1847, in concert with Cesare Balbo, he had published a sketch, drafted as far back as 1827, for a free constitution (*progetto di Statuto*) in accordance with his religious and political principles; it was to show the way to a *costituzione secondo la giustizia sociale*.² Rosmini realised that even the Papal States must sooner or later have a constitution, and he feared lest it should be, as so many of the free constitutions of that time were, a bad copy of the French. He wished therefore to make a draft of a better one himself. But his proposal, which was handed to Pius IX. by Cardinal Castracane, came too late; Rome had shortly before obtained her new charter.

Pius IX., however, invited him to push the matter further, and Rosmini, at the same time that he finished a new edition of the draft for a constitution, published a hitherto unprinted work, composed in the year 1832: "On the Five Wounds of the Holy Church" (*Delle cinque piaghe della Santa Chiesa*). In his draft for a constitution, he maintained the liberty of the Church and the election of the bishops by the clergy and people, according to ancient custom, with confirmation by the Pope. The form of government in a modern state ought, in his opinion, to be a limited monarchy. The legislative power ought to rest with the King and two chambers, the executive

¹ Bianchi V, 198.

² Fr. Paoli: *Della vita di A. Rosmini-Serbati* (Torino 1880), 355f.

with the King. The citizens ought to have full personal liberty, and the constitution ought to secure to every one the inviolability of house and property, the right of public meeting, the freedom of the Press and of education. In an appendix Rosmini developed his ideas about the unity of Italy. His ideal was an Italian federation ruled by a federal diet (*Dieta*), which should meet at Rome under the protection of the Pope. Like Gioberti, he was convinced that a constitutional monarchy was the only form of government which could secure the independence and unity of Italy, and he was of opinion that a monarchy could, in fact, ensure as great a degree of liberty as a republic, if only it were surrounded by popular institutions. His book concluded with a warning against making Italy by a crude republicanism into another South America, and with an appeal to act: *si faccia, si faccia!*¹

In the work on the Five Wounds of the Holy Church² Rosmini propounded his programme of reform. Whilst Gioberti now attacked the temporal power of the Pope, the Inquisition, and the Jesuits, Rosmini took up the famous reforming proposal of 1537, which was made under the auspices of Paul III. by the Cardinals Contarini, Caraffa, Sadoletto, Reginald Pole, and others, and he discerned the root of all Rome's misfortunes in the refined flattery of the jurists and the canonists, which turned *libito* into *licito*, making permissible whatever people liked. The first "wound" of the Church was the breach in the proper relation between clergy and laity, which was a necessary result of the imperfect education of the lay people, and the use of Latin in the services of the sanctuary. The second "wound" was the insufficient education of the priesthood, which led to the division of the ministers of the Church into two classes, and to many other misfortunes. Thus Rosmini complained bitterly that the seminaries were directed by inexperienced persons of little influence, and that it was quite overlooked that only great men can educate great men. The third "wound" was the want of unity among the bishops; the fourth, their appointment by the temporal power; the fifth, the way that the property of the Church was tied up,

¹ Kraus, 65, 69f.

² [Translated into English by Henry Parry Liddon].

which resulted in its not always being possible to use it according to the original intention.

Rosmini's book made a great sensation both at Rome and at Turin. At Rome, at a later date, Augustin Theiner wrote a refutation of it,¹ in which he attempted to demonstrate that Rosmini's ideas would lead to a *Popolopapism* which was the exact opposite to the *Cæsareopapism*, and he attacked many particular points in the book besides. But Pius IX. was pleased with much that it contained, and wished to make the acquaintance of its author. It was therefore a happy choice of Charles Albert, when, on the suggestion of Gioberti, he sent Rosmini to Rome to negotiate for the conclusion of a political alliance, which would draw the Pope into taking part in the war against Austria, and also to open the prospect of a new Sardinian Concordat, giving all ministers of the Church, except the Jesuits and the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, full liberty of assembly. The priest of Stresa was not absolutely against the idea of a war with Austria.² If it were established that a pope could never go to war, the world would draw the conclusion, he says, that temporal dominion is quite incompatible with the Papacy. The question was, therefore, only whether a war was justified, and in this case the Austrians in Lombardy and Venice had, in Rosmini's opinion, suppressed national and ecclesiastical liberty to such an extent that it was just to compel them to abandon those districts. The vacillating attitude of the Pope was, he considered, fraught with great danger; it might easily result in an estrangement between the people and the priesthood, and in St Peter's successor being looked upon as a substantial hindrance to the liberty, unity, and independence of Italy. And what would the Pope do with regard to Rome and Italy at large, if Rome and Italy were to rise against him? ³

Such were the thoughts of the pious and learned priest, who in the middle of August 1848 travelled to Rome as the envoy of Charles Albert.⁴ Shortly before his arrival, on 2nd August,

¹ Kraus, 74f.

² Paoli: *Vita di Rosmini*, letter of 9th May to Don Gilardi, 360f.

³ Paoli, letter of 17th May to Cardinal Castracane, 366f.

⁴ Rosmini has himself minutely described his mission to Rome in the book *Della*

the Mamiani ministry had been succeeded by a new one, of which the president was Cardinal Soglia, but everybody could see that the new government's days would be but few.¹ The Pope received the priest of Stresa very kindly, and at once held out the prospect to him both of the cardinal's purple and of the Secretaryship of State.² But when it came to the point of finding a successor to Cardinal Soglia, he turned at the instigation of Rosmini himself³ to Count Pellegrino Rossi. As early as the month of July, when Pius IX. was tired of working with Mamiani, Pasolini had directed his attention to the former French ambassador who, during his stay at Rome, had won the respect and affection of the moderate Italian Liberals.⁴ But at that time the project of a Rossi ministry came to nothing. The rumour of its possibility drove the Radicals to fury, and Sterbini declared in the presence of several deputies, that if Rossi, Louis Philippe's ambassador and Guizot's friend, should dare to appear in the Roman Parliament as the Pope's minister, he would be stoned.⁵ Whether it was deference to the threats of the Radicals, or the difficulties of the Count in finding colleagues for the intended ministry, which hindered its formation in July is not known. But in September Rossi was sent for once more, and on the 16th of that month the *Gazzetta di Roma* contained the list of the new ministers. Cardinal Soglia continued to be President of the Council and Secretary for Foreign Affairs; Rossi took the Home Office and also, temporarily, the Treasury; Cardinal Vizzardelli became Minister of Education. The other posts were filled by laymen.⁶

Professor Antonio Montanari, who had been appointed to the post of Minister of Commerce, told Minghetti a couple of weeks after the formation of the ministry, that the new government had been very heartily received by the Pope.⁷ His Holiness

Missione a Roma, published at Turin in 1881, together with a collection of documents. The "Commentary" itself concludes with a solemn declaration that "tutto quello che si legge in questo Commentario è intieramente conforme alla verità" (p. 163). Cp. also Bianchi VI, 1f.

¹ The names are given in Spada II, 444.

² Rosmini: *Della Missione a Roma*, 54f.

³ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁴ Pasolini, 121f. Cp. Minghetti II, 99 and 188f., as supplement to Farini's account.

⁵ Pasolini, 136.

⁶ Spada II, 466.

⁷ See his letter of 2nd October in Minghetti, 381f.

had given an assurance that it was his aim to develop the Liberal institutions which he had granted to his own country, and to promote reforms, especially in finance and in the army department. Rome, in Montanari's opinion, had settled quietly down. Only the Radicals were angry. Montanari was full of admiration for Rossi, who gave the ministry its colour. He became every day more and more convinced that the Count was a great statesman, who combined splendid theoretical and practical qualities. The man, whom Gregory XVI. and Lambruschini a few years before had had great hesitation in receiving as French ambassador, was now, in spite of his revolutionary past and his Protestant wife, a highly valued minister of the Pope, and the helper of the Papacy in its time of need.¹

Count Rossi's programme can be ascertained from certain notes (*Lettres d'un dilettante de la politique sur l'Allemagne, la France et l'Italie*) which were in part printed, though at a later date.² It was Rossi's aim to reconcile Italy with the Papacy by bringing about a federation of the Italian sovereigns under the leadership of the Papacy; but Rosmini's idea of the formation of a league between the states of Italy, as distinguished from their sovereigns, found in him an opponent, because he considered that such a league would convert the Italian sovereigns, and especially the Pope, into prefects or under prefects.³ Rossi wished Sardinia to be enlarged by the addition of Lombardy, Venice, Parma, and Modena, so that there might be a strong power on the northern frontier of Italy, which should form a bulwark against the Austrians, and thereby a protection for the Papal States. He also considered the Pope's vacillating attitude towards Austria reprehensible. "The national movement," he wrote, "is like a sword. Either Pius IX. must resolutely take it in hand, or else the Revolution will seize it and turn it against him." But Rossi saw also that most of the sober-minded Romans decidedly wished for peace, and that there was no readiness to make

¹ In Pasolini's *Memorie* his son relates (p. 123) that some of Rossi's books were put on the Index, and that Pius IX. answered, when the elder Pasolini referred to the fact, "Questo non fa niente." This can scarcely be true. Rossi's name is not found in the *Index librorum prohibitorum* (Roma 1881).

² Cp. Mazade in the *Revue des deux mondes* for 1881, 747f., and H. d'Ideville: *Le Comte Pellegrino Rossi* (Paris 1887).

³ Rosmini: *Della missione a Roma*, 55f. Cp. Bianchi VI, 1f.

sacrifices which could not ensure a good result. He was convinced that Italy, at bottom, was neither communistic nor Radical, as Mazzini asserted, and the Radicals, in his opinion, had only been able to gain influence by artfully placing themselves at the head of the national party. The point was therefore to hoist the banner of Italy in the Papal States as elsewhere, and to bring about order and obedience at home.

As soon as information reached France that Pius IX. was in treaty with Count Rossi about his entering the papal ministry, General Cavaignac began to move; for the republican government did not wish to see Guizot's friend a minister of the Pope.¹ The French ambassador at Rome, the Duke of Harcourt, received a despatch, in which he was charged to notify the Pope that a Rossi ministry would not only be a violation of the friendly relations that ought to exist between France and the Holy See, but also of the respect which the two governments owed to each other. Pius IX. took no notice of the remonstrances of France; a ministry, in which the former French ambassador occupied a leading position, was at that time the only way out of the difficulty.

In order to gain his end Rossi proceeded with the strictest justice.² He offended both the reactionaries and the Radicals. He gave laymen important offices, which had formerly been reserved for prelates; but, on the other hand, he expelled Garibaldi from Rome, and imprisoned Alessandro Gavazzi at Bologna, because Gavazzi kept the lower classes of the population in a ferment by his half-political, half-religious evening sermons on the ruins of ancient Rome.³ It was the Citizen King's policy of the *Via Media* that Rossi wished to introduce upon Italian soil. The misfortune was that the Papal States had no middle class, and that Rossi came into power after the fall of the kingdom of July, at a time when one after another of the Neo-Guelphs was passing over to Ghibellinism, because they perceived that the temporal power of the Pope could not be maintained any longer, and did not deserve to be.

Although Rosmini had wished that Count Rossi should

¹ Mazade, 749f. Cp. E. Ollivier in the *Revue des deux mondes*, 1896, 360f.

² D'Ideville, 199f.

³ Cp. *Orations by Father Gavazzi* (London 1851) I.—II.

take the lead in papal politics, he soon became an opponent of the new government, which seemed to him more like a dictatorship than a ministry.¹ He laid his objections to Rossi's programme before Pius IX. in detail, but he did not succeed in making any impression upon the Pope, who had perfect confidence in Rossi.² The priest of Stresa then retired despondently for a time to the convent of the Passionists on the Cælian Hill, to submit himself to his usual spiritual exercises; but as soon as they were over, he again entered the political arena, full of anxious forebodings for what was to happen. He was also passing through personal troubles of his own. His theological and philosophical opponents were actively endeavouring to have him censured for sundry utterances in the *Delle cinque piaghe*; but Pius IX., for the moment, turned a deaf ear to the accusations of these fanatics. At an audience which Rosmini had at the beginning of November, Pius IX. told him that in spite of all slanders and theological intrigues he meant to appoint him cardinal at a consistory to be held in December, and shortly before, the Pope's confessor, Mgr. Stella, had once more held out to Rosmini a prospect of the Secretaryship of State.³

Meanwhile the clouds were gathering over the Pope's minister, whom so many detested, and who exerted all his strength upon the hopeless task of founding a constitutional government amongst a people who were fundamentally at variance with their sovereign. But Count Rossi, to the last, was full of hope. On 14th November he said to the Bavarian envoy, Count Spaur, that he and the other diplomatists might rest assured that the path to any attack upon the authority of the Pope must go over his corpse.⁴ On the following day the Roman Parliament was to be re-opened. Rossi received as many warnings as Julius Cæsar did before the fateful Ides of March, but he answered: "They will not dare! The Pope's cause is God's cause." Pius IX. took leave of him with deep emotion when he drove to the Parliament, and he did not conceal his anxious forebodings from the courageous minister.

¹ Rosmini: *Della missione a Roma*, 53.

² *Ibid.*, 56f. Paoli, 406f.

³ Rosmini, 78f. and 318f. Paoli, 407.

⁴ Bianchi VI, 16.

But Rossi left his sovereign in the firm belief that he went "to bury the Revolution."¹

Others were not so confident. When Rosmini drove to the Piazza della Cancelleria with the Sardinian ambassador, he received a very disagreeable impression of the crowd that surrounded the carriage, and the sense of uneasiness increased when he looked out over the deputies from the diplomatists' gallery in the hall of assembly.² Suddenly he heard a cry, followed by hooting and whistling, and then there was a disturbance in the house. Shortly afterwards a man came and whispered to the Sardinian ambassador: "They have murdered Rossi." And it was true.³ When the minister got out of his carriage and had walked some steps up the staircase which led to the Palazzo della Cancelleria, he was surrounded by conspirators, and one of them stabbed him with a dagger in the throat. He was carried into Cardinal Gazzoli's apartments. Dr Pantaleoni sent and fetched a priest coming back from a dying person, to whom he had administered Extreme Unction, but, when the priest arrived, it was too late. Count Rossi expired in the course of a few minutes.⁴

The deputies received the news of Rossi's murder in silence. "Not one voice," says Farini indignantly, "was raised to pray God and men to forgive this crime."⁵ Several of the deputies were even privy to the murder. On 10th October, the Radicals had held a secret meeting at Turin, at which, in the presence of Sterbini and the Prince of Canino, they had determined that Rossi should die;⁶ and Mazzini had declared that his death was inevitable; "for," as a Radical Italian paper wrote after the

¹ Farini II, 365f. Spada II, 506f. Paoli, 407f. Pasolini, 140 and 145, where Dr Fusconi's account is to be found.

² Cp. his letter to Donna Adelaide Rosmini in *Della missione a Roma*, 320f.

³ D'Ideville, 250f.

⁴ Guizot writes (VIII, 415) the following remarkable words about his death: "On dit qu'à quatre-vingt-deux ans, en apprenant la mort du Maréchal de Berwick, emporté par un boulet de canon, le Maréchal de Villars s'écria: 'J'avais toujours bien dit que cet homme-là était plus heureux que moi.' La mort de M. Rossi peut inspirer la même envie, et il était digne du même bonheur."

⁵ Cp. the despatch of the Duke of Harcourt to the French national assembly in J. F. Maguire: *Rome; its Ruler and its Institutions* (2nd ed., London 1859), p. 58.

⁶ Kraus, *loc. cit.*, 225f.

murder, "with his genius and his experience he would have been able to do great damage to our cause."¹ During the night between 13th and 14th November Rossi had had two members of the *Circolo Romano* arrested, and as the two bandits were led to the gallows at Cività Vecchia they hinted that this arrest would cost Rossi dear. On the evening of 14th November the Radicals held a meeting in the Capranica theatre, at which they agreed that the minister should be murdered the next day, when he went into the Palazzo della Cancelleria; and Grandoni and his gang undertook to carry out "the people's" decision.²

From the Palazzo della Cancelleria Rosmini drove straight to the Quirinal, and endeavoured to induce the horror-stricken Pope to take three important decisions: to call General Zucchi, who was at Bologna with his troops, to Rome; to form a new ministry immediately; and to institute a thorough investigation of the exact circumstances connected with the murder of Rossi. But only as to the first point was the Pope able to follow Rosmini's advice; the other two suggestions could not be carried out, because the town was already in an uproar. Sterbini, the Prince of Canino, and Ciceruacchio incited their followers to make use of the moment to overthrow the papal government and proclaim the republic, and armed gangs paraded the streets singing:

"Benedetta quella mano
Che il tiranno pugnàlò!"

The next morning the civil guard mustered on the Piazza del Popolo, and by flatteries and lies the troops of the line, the carabineers, and the dragoons alike were won over to the Revolution, so that they fraternised with the mob. A crowd marched to Monte Cavallo, and demanded a new democratic ministry, the declaration of war against Austria, and an Italian Constituent Assembly. In the Quirinal the Pope had gathered the president and the vice-president of the *Alto Consiglio*, Mgr. Muzzarelli and Count Pasolini, and the president and vice-president of the Chamber of Deputies, the

¹ Minghetti II, 415.

² Subsequently a long trial was opened that ended on 17th May 1854 with the sentence of death upon Grandoni and another bandit named Santa Constantini, but Grandoni committed suicide in prison. D'Ideville, 292f.

advocate Sturbinetti and Dr Fusconi, and with them he discussed what was to be done.¹ When Muzzarelli hinted that Rossi was not liked, and that His Holiness was perhaps too much affected by his death, Pius IX. got angry, and expressed his indignation that a Monsignore in his presence should dare to offer an apology for such a murder. He then turned to Dr Fusconi, and asked him to take Rossi's place, but the doctor made his excuses. He next approached Pasolini and Minghetti, but they both declared that they could only dare to take up the reins of government, provided that the Papal States would join in the war of independence.

Meanwhile, on the Piazza in front of the Quirinal the multitude continued loudly to demand a new ministry, and many cried out that Rosmini should be President of the Council and Minister of Education. The civil guard and the troops, which had gathered under the banner of the *Circolo Popolare*, advanced from the Piazza del Popolo up to Monte Cavallo, and joined the popular demand for a new government. At the Pope's desire they were admonished to retire, and the promise was offered them that he would fulfil their wish, if they would only let him do it of his free will. But the mob would not follow his admonition. They attacked the Swiss guard which protected the Quirinal, and tried to set fire to the door of the palace. Several shots were fired; one of them killed the Pope's secretary, Mgr. Palma, and three bullets penetrated into the Pope's own room. Then a cannon was placed before the gate of the Quirinal to blow it in. Pius IX. thereupon promised to choose a new democratic ministry, but at the same time he declared to the *Corps diplomatique*, which had collected at the palace, that he only gave way on compulsion, and in order to avoid worse disaster.² His promise called forth mad rejoicings. The populace ran about the streets shouting *Viva Bruto secondo!* and a mob sang the *Miserere* in front of Rossi's house, and demanded that the minister's corpse should be taken out to Porta Leone, where the carcasses of dead animals were thrown.

At nine o'clock in the evening Rosmini received a letter, in which he was informed that the Pope had chosen him to be President of the Council and Minister of Education in a

¹ Cp. Fusconi's letter in Pasolini, 145f.

² Madame Spaur: *Relation du voyage de Pie IX. à Gaète* (Paris 1852), p. 7.

new ministry, and that the rest of the members of it—amongst others, Mamiani, Galletti, and Sterbini—so far as they were in town—would meet at his apartments in the Palazzo Albani next morning.¹ Immediately on the receipt of this letter Rosmini sent his secretary to the Quirinal to obtain further information, and to ask an audience of the Pope. Pius IX. said that he expected to find protection (*un antimurale*) in the priest of Stresa, but at the same time that he was “afraid of being crushed.” As Rosmini could see from this that the Pope would not impose it upon him as a duty to form the new ministry, he went the same night to the Quirinal and sent in a request to be relieved from the task assigned.

When Galletti came to the Palazzo Albani on the morning of 17th November to discuss matters with Rosmini, Rosmini was not at home. But there was a letter waiting for him,² in which Rosmini declared that the new ministry was unconstitutional, because it was forced upon the Pope, and that he himself had refused to take part in such a breach of the constitution. He had gone to the church of the Santi Apostoli to say Mass, and when that was over, he went to the French embassy, where he found Count Rossi's widow. At a later hour a message came from the Sardinian ambassador proposing that he should spend the night at the Sardinian embassy. It was not till 18th November, therefore, that he returned to his home; and, as he supposed that Pius IX. had left Rome, as he had himself advised him, Rosmini thought it best to go out likewise to the Villa Albani beyond the Porta Salara, and to have horses and carriage ready, so as to be able to leave the town at short notice.³ Some of the cardinals, like Lambruschini, who were eagerly sought for by assassins, had already left Rome in disguise.

After Rosmini's refusal, Mgr. Muzzarelli had accepted the post of President of the Council; but Count Mamiani who, only arrived in Rome on the evening of 23rd November, would not accept the portfolio offered to him. Pius IX., however, viewed the formation of the new ministry with great indifference, for no matter how it was composed, it would be revolutionary,

¹ Cp. his letter in *Della missione a Roma*, 323f.

² Copied in Rosmini: *Della missione*, 82f.

³ Rosmini: *Della missione*, 85.

and he had now firmly made up his mind to forsake his capital. On 17th November there were bright Northern Lights in the sky, and it looked as if Rome were in flames. People looked upon this phenomenon, so unusual in Italy, as an omen of great misfortunes, and Pius IX. was most anxious.¹ A few days later he received from the Bishop of Valence a letter and the silver receptacle in which Pius VI. during his exile had carried the Host with him. This gift, under such circumstances, was like a heavenly warning to fly. Count Spaur had promised to help him if he wished to do so, and Antonelli was now sent to the Bavarian ambassador to arrange details. At an earlier period Pius IX. had thought of going to the Balearic Islands, and a Spanish frigate had for some time been riding at anchor at Cività Vecchia to take him thither. But when flight was seriously contemplated, the frigate had disappeared—it is not known for what reason. Antonelli then proposed Gaëta as a temporary place of abode;² from thence it would be easy by sea to reach the Balearic Islands, or France, or Piedmont. He arranged with Count Spaur that early on the morning of the 24th the Countess should leave Rome, and that the Count, with Pius IX. in his carriage, should join her later at Albano.³ The servants and others were to be told that a journey to Naples was intended, where the Count had diplomatic affairs to see to.

The Countess Spaur left Rome on the morning of 24th November, and in the afternoon at five o'clock the Duke of Harcourt, who was also privy to the plan, paid a visit to the Quirinal. His carriage continued to drive up and down before the palace, in order that the passers-by in the street might think that he was having an audience of the Pope. As soon as the Duke entered the Quirinal, Pius IX. took off his white cassock and white skull-cap, and dressed himself in the garb of an ordinary priest. A big pair of spectacles made him still more unrecognisable. Thus disguised, he was, according to the arrangement, to leave by a back door, and the French ambassador was to remain in the Quirinal until the Pope had

¹ A. von Reumont: *Aus König Friedrich Wilhelms IV. gesunden und kranken Tagen*, 332.

² Rosmini: *Della missione*, 93.

³ Madame Spaur, 9f. A. von Reumont: *Beiträge* III, 101f., and Paoli, 413.

succeeded in getting safely away. Pius IX. after some minor difficulties made his escape from his palace, and accompanied by a faithful servant, reached the appointed trysting-place, where Count Spaur was waiting with his carriage, into which he mounted. At Arricia the Count overtook his wife, and she said, as had been agreed, to the Pope: "Get into my carriage, Doctor, but make haste; I do not like travelling at night." Pius IX. then drove away in the Countess's carriage, and as soon as he had reached Gaëta in safety, he sent Count Spaur to Naples with a letter, in which he informed King Ferdinand that he had sought an asylum at Gaëta, "in order not to compromise his dignity, or by his silence to approve of the excesses that had taken place and might take place in Rome." The day after the receipt of this letter King Ferdinand and his family sailed with two battalions of soldiers to Gaëta, and gradually a great many cardinals, diplomatists, and Roman noblemen assembled there.¹

¹ Spada III, 72f., enumerates those who assembled there.

CHAPTER XVIII

VICTORIES AND DEFEATS

PIUS IX. was not the first of the popes who found a refuge in the rocky Neapolitan fortress. As early as 1118, Gelasius II. had sought shelter behind the strong walls of Gaëta, and later popes had also taken refuge there.

At first Pius IX. preserved his incognito strictly; but as soon as the Neapolitan Royal Family arrived, he moved from the modest inn (Il Giardinetto) to one of the royal palaces, and Gaëta became little by little a centre for the political reaction. At length Pius IX. had altogether twenty-seven cardinals round him—amongst others, Bernetti, Lambruschini and Gizzi; but he did not confide in any of these. Cardinal Antonelli, who had escaped from Rome by the help of the Spanish Secretary of Legation, acted as a sort of temporary Secretary of State, and he became master of the situation. Under his influence Pius drew the conclusion from his experiences, that a pope ought not to support the cause of Italy nor the cause of freedom. It was evidently not unwelcome to Antonelli that the revolution in Rome was making progress. The way would thereby be prepared for an Austrian invasion, and this was the best and surest way for himself and the reaction to come into power.¹

After the Pope's flight, the Muzzarelli Cabinet issued a proclamation, in which they promised to do their duty towards the country and the people.² The Romans were highly exasperated, because Pius IX. had left their town, and on 27th November Padre Ventura delivered in S. Andrea della Valle an inflammatory sermon upon the insurgents who had fallen during the revolution at Vienna; it created great enthusiasm throughout Rome.³ But

¹ Rosmini: *Della missione* 94, after a saying of "un uomo di stato."

² Spada III, 17f.

³ Fragments of the speech in Spada III, 20f.

on the same day Pius IX. signed a communication to his dearly beloved subjects, in which he regretted that the violence which he had suffered had compelled him to leave the children whom he had loved and whom he still loved. Until his return a Commission of Regency, consisting of Cardinal Castracane, General Zucchi, and five other trusted men, was to rule the affairs of the Papal States.¹

Rosmini, who, at the express desire of Pius IX., had gone to Gaëta, attempted together with the former minister, Montanari, and one or two of the Pope's relations, to show the angry pontiff that the appointment of the proposed Commission of Regency was against the existing Constitution, inasmuch as the Pope's missive was not countersigned by a minister; and that this measure would be most unpractical, because the seven members of the Commission lived at different places, and would have great difficulties in meeting. Rosmini thought it would have been best to make Imola or Ravenna a temporary seat of the government, and to endeavour from thence to restore order in the capital.² Rosmini regretted also that the Pope had not left behind him a proclamation when he fled. But neither his objections nor his complaints made any particular impression on the Pope. When Rosmini was received in audience, Antonelli casually entered the room apparently in search of something, but in reality to catch something of the conversation; and after the audience was over he did his best to efface any traces left by the objections of the priest of Stresa. Rosmini must be vanquished before Antonelli could be sure of having Pius IX. completely in his power for the future. Several plots were therefore laid during the period that followed, the object of which was to make Rosmini impossible both as a candidate for the cardinal's purple, and for the Secretaryship of State.

The inhabitants of Rome read with indignation the protest of Pius IX., and the Roman Chamber of Deputies declared, as Rosmini had foreseen, that St Peter's successor had broken the Constitution which he had himself granted. It was then resolved to send a deputation of five members to Gaëta to treat with the papal refugee, and to appeal to him to return to Rome. But the deputation was stopped on the frontier by the

¹ Rosmini, 338f

² *Ibid.*, 95f., 99f.

Neapolitan police.¹ Dr Fusconi, on the other hand, succeeded in reaching Gaëta, and in spite of the hindrances put in his way by Antonelli,² he obtained an audience of the Pope. But his mission was without result. The breach between the Pope and the revolutionary Romans was now incurable. On 7th December the Pope issued an ordinance, prolonging the session of the *Alto Consiglio* and the Chamber of Deputies; but this indirect acknowledgment of the Constitution never came to the knowledge of the public,³ and the Chamber acted without regard to the Pope, who was looked upon at Rome as the prisoner of the Bourbons. The shout was heard in the streets: *Viva la Costituente!* and a Giunta was formed, consisting of Prince Corsini, the advocate Galletti, and the Gonfaloniere of Ancona, Count Camerata, who, as a provisional government, called together the Constituent Assembly which was demanded. Many Radical and revolutionary persons, both from abroad and from the rest of Italy, came to Rome—amongst others, Garibaldi, who was received by Ciceruacchio, with an embrace and a poem, which contained the following lines:

“Un fatto d’armi io vorrei;
Non più paternostri e giubilei.”

Rosmini had suggested that Pius IX. should issue a more explicit appeal to his subjects, and at the wish of the Pope he had sketched out such an one himself.⁴ But it was quashed by Antonelli. The priest of Stresa had spoken too definitely of the maintenance of the free Constitution, and in mentioning Pellegrino Rossi he had dwelt upon his “profound works,” although several of these had met with serious disapproval from Rome during the time of Gregory XVI. When the news of the formation of the Giunta reached Gaëta, it was imperative to say something, but it was Antonelli who stepped forth as spokesman in a new and sharp protest of 17th December.⁵ It only poured oil on the fire, and anarchy appeared more and more openly at Rome. Mazzini now came

¹ Spada III, 56. Rosmini, 340f., where there is an account of the meeting of protest held by the Chamber of Deputies on 3rd December.

² Pasolini, 158f.

³ Spada III, 58f.

⁴ Rosmini, 108f.

⁵ Printed among the documents in Rosmini, 346.

to the city, to share in the harvest from the poisonous seed which he had himself sown; and at length there are said to have been about 20,000 political refugees and adventurers gathered in the city of St Peter. They would not be content with a *Costituente Romana*; a Constituent Assembly for all Italy, a *Costituente Nazionale Italiana*, must also meet at Rome. "The Italian union which the poor Pope dreamt of," Metternich writes in his Memoirs, "leads to ruffianly exploits, and more exploits of that kind will be seen, before the equilibrium between the possible and impossible, between history and romance, is reached."¹

Antonelli undoubtedly saw with inward satisfaction the situation at Rome developing as he had wished. But every step was met with a protest from the Pope, until the confusion was so great that remonstrance was superfluous. On New Year's Day, 1849, Pius IX. reminded the public that the Council of Trent had threatened to excommunicate anybody who dared to attack the temporal power of the Pope.² Courageous priests, in danger of their lives, posted this menacing document at street corners and on church doors at Rome; and from Castel Gandolfo the three members of the papal Commission of Regency, headed by Cardinal Castracane, issued on 18th January a protest against everything that had taken place at Rome.³ But these remonstrances were of no avail. The elections to the Constituent Assembly were made out, and as Pius IX. had forbidden all his adherents either to vote or to allow themselves to be voted for, the Assembly came to consist almost solely of the enemies of the Papacy. On 9th February a decree was passed after a short debate and by a large majority, which stated that the Papacy had forfeited the temporal rule of the States of the Church, but, on the other hand, full independence was assured to the Roman Pope in the execution of his spiritual power. The Papal States were hereafter to be "a pure democracy, which bore the glorious name of the Roman Republic, and which made such connexions with the rest of Italy, as the common nationality demanded."⁴

The revolution at Rome had now advanced as far as Antonelli wished, and an intervention was now an imperative

¹ Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* VIII, 195.

² Spada III, 116f.

³ *Ibid.*, 106f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 202f.

necessity. On 18th February, therefore, the Cardinal, on behalf of Pius IX., sent a note to Austria, France, Spain, and Naples, in which, after a survey of the past government of his master, he appealed to those powers for help, on the ground that they were especially called upon to extirpate anarchy at Rome, on account of their geographical position, and their devotion to the Papacy.¹

Both the French and the Piedmontese government had desired to show the Pope hospitality if he were obliged to leave Rome. The republican government in France hoped to strengthen its position, and to win the sympathy of the Catholic population, by being as friendly as possible towards St Peter's successor. As early as the beginning of December 1848, Louis Bonaparte had considered it wise, in an article in the *Journal des Débats*, to disclaim all connexion with the Prince of Canino, and to say that the Pope's temporal sovereignty was as necessary for the splendour of the Catholic Church as for the liberty and independence of Italy.² The French were so certain that Pius IX. would seek shelter in their country that one of the ministers travelled to Marseilles, in order to accompany him to Paris.³

The flight of Pius IX. was to Charles Albert a cause of great sorrow, because for him it presaged the triumph of the demagogues, and the overthrow of the Italian cause.⁴ The government at Turin, however, did not merely wish that Pius IX. should take up his abode for the time being in Piedmont; they offered also to mediate between the Papacy and the Roman revolutionaries. The Piedmontese feared lest any foreign power, whether Austria, France, or Spain, which undertook this duty of mediation, should seize the opportunity to establish itself firmly in Central Italy. Gioberti, who at that time was the Piedmontese Prime Minister, went even so far as to propound the principle that the Pope durst not seek help from any but an Italian power. In no other way could he free Italy from the ignominy of a foreign invasion.⁵

But, according to Antonelli, the interference of Piedmont

¹ Farini III, 252f.

² It is reprinted in Spada III, 54f.

³ Bianchi VI, 19f. Döllinger, 576.

⁴ Cappelletti, 454.

⁵ Farini III, 253f. Cp. Döllinger, 576, after Massari: *Ricordi e carteggio di Gioberti* III, 284f.

was not to be thought of. The Piedmontese government could only offer a peaceful diplomatic mediation; what was wanted was armed help. And besides this, the Pope and his counsellor had no confidence whatever in the Piedmontese. Charles Albert had not, like the other powers, broken off diplomatic relations with the revolutionary government at Rome, and the Court of Turin had even wished to entice the Neapolitan government into taking part in the war of independence, by promising King Ferdinand Benevento, which formed part of the papal territory. It was in vain that Gioberti reminded Antonelli of the inclination of the popes themselves to keep up diplomatic relations with existing governments without scrupulous examination of their legitimacy, and he explained to him, to no purpose, that the idea was to allot to the Papacy a piece of Tuscany in compensation for Benevento. Antonelli hated Gioberti, the enemy of the Jesuits, and he had no confidence in the stability of Piedmontese affairs. While Rosmini wished for help from France, Antonelli preferred to see order at Rome re-established by Austrian soldiers, and by Austrian statecraft.

As early as June 1848, Pius IX. had asked France to send two or three thousand men to the Papal See; but Cavaignac would only grant protection for the Pope's personal safety, not help towards the restoration of order in the Papal States.¹ Now, when the question of intervention was again under debate, Rosmini attempted with the greatest zeal to get France to provide the moral, military, and pecuniary support which the Papacy needed;² but the Duke of Harcourt pointed out that St Peter's see had treated the French government of the day very coldly. Besides this, there was a great difficulty. The party, which was in power at Rome, would not recognise the temporal authority of the Pope, and most of the counsellors of Pius IX. would have nothing to do with a free Constitution for Rome. They did not, indeed, say so openly; they only said that the country was not ripe for a constitution, but it was easy to see that they would prefer to have the existing Constitution annulled.³

¹ Rosmini's letter of 9th January 1849 to the Duke of Harcourt, in Rosmini, 130f.

² His letter to the Duke of Harcourt, in Rosmini, 127f.

³ Harcourt's answer, in Rosmini, 128f.

After the receipt of the answer of the Duke of Harcourt Rosmini went to Pius IX. and told him that the French government doubted his readiness to uphold the charter which he had granted to his subjects. The Pope dismissed the doubt as an insult, and when Rosmini went on to remark that the doubt was really concerning the attitude of mind of his counsellors, Pius IX. replied that he had, on three different occasions, discussed the charter with the College of Cardinals, and that every one of the cardinals had approved of it.¹ But Rosmini was not at all satisfied. He knew the weakness of his sovereign, and he began to realise the effects of the intrigues that had been set on foot in order to destroy his influence with the weak Pope.

There were many who had taken offence at Rosmini's statements in *Delle cinque piaghe* to the effect that it was the proper thing for the priests and congregations to elect the bishops, and he was accused of being an advocate of the separation of the Church from the State. In order to inform the Pope of his real position towards these two questions, Rosmini, after some discussion with Mgr. Corboli - Bussi, delivered to Pius IX. a more lengthy explanation. But it did not satisfy Antonelli, and accordingly Pius IX. informed Rosmini that it was "not sufficiently explicit." The priest of Stresa was now also struck by the fact that one after another of the Pope's entourage, drew back from him; even the Pope's confessor, Mgr. Stella, who had formerly been so kind, suddenly became remarkably cold, and it began to be said in Gaëta, that Rosmini was not going to be made a cardinal after all.² When Rosmini had gone to Naples to have a devotional book printed, he heard that a very personal attack had been made upon him in the Pope's antechamber. He had been called a hypocrite, a communist, and *una vera piaga della Chiesa*.³ He also learned accidentally at Naples, that Cardinal Angelo Mai had been commissioned to examine all his writings, but that the learned Cardinal had declined the task, because metaphysics were not his special subject, and because he did not think that he could find time to peruse the thirty volumes which Rosmini had composed.

When the priest of Stresa returned to Gaëta, on 9th June 1849, great changes had taken place. As soon as Pius IX. saw him,

¹ Rosmini, 134.

² *Ibid.*, 139f.

³ *Ibid.*, 141.

he exclaimed: "I am now anti-constitutional." When Rosmini then endeavoured to make him understand that it was a serious matter for a successor of St Peter thus to alter his course and to divide his reign into two, Pius IX. declared that he had come to see that a free constitution was incompatible with ecclesiastical government, and that the liberty of the Press, liberty of meeting, and so forth, were pernicious things (*cosa intrinsecamente cattiva*).¹ Shortly after his return to Gaëta, Rosmini learned also that Antonelli had got the Neapolitan police to examine his political writings, with a view to finding in them something that might render harmless his hated competitor for the favour of Pius IX.; and Pius IX. himself, as if in passing, let fall some hints to Rosmini, that two of his books were being examined. He might have said much more. As early as 13th May, the Congregation of the Index had pronounced condemnation upon the books, *Delle cinque piaghe*, and *La Costituzione secondo la giustizia sociale*, and on 6th June, Pius IX. had secretly authorised the placing of these two works on the Index of forbidden books. Rosmini, who was himself an adviser to the Congregation of the Index, did not receive the official communication until 13th August, long after he had left Gaëta and was staying as the guest of Cardinal Tosti at Albano. Before he left Gaëta he once more handed to Pius IX. a detailed explanation of his standpoint;² but the fate of the two books had already been finally decided. For a nature like Rosmini's, there was nothing else to be done under such circumstances but to submit at once, and return quietly to Stresa. He sent to the *magister sacri palatii*, a letter informing him of his absolute submission,³ and then went home to his daily round after the unmitigated failure of his "Roman Mission." Thus Antonelli got rid of his most dangerous rival for the Secretaryship of State, and the Roman Constitution lost its last sincere friend in the entourage of Pius IX.

Whilst Antonelli by these intrigues was rendering his opponent harmless, great events had taken place on the political stage. On 12th March, Charles Albert had put an end to the truce which he had made in the previous August with Austria, and a week later war broke out. The Piedmontese

¹ Rosmini, 143.

² *Ibid.*, 150f.

³ *Ibid.*, 159f.

king marched with a comparatively large army, commanded by the Pole, Chrzanovsky, to Novara ; there the soldiers, incited by the party of Mazzini, entered the shops and took goods without paying, but with the ironical assurance : *Paga Pio IX.*¹ After some minor portions of the Piedmontese army had suffered reverses at Mortara and Vigevano, the main army was defeated at Novara on 23rd March, and thereupon Charles Albert resigned the throne in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel, then twenty-nine years of age, who had to make peace on conditions which for the present made the Austrians masters of Northern Italy. Some days after the battle of Novara, on 29th March, the "sovereign people" committed the executive power at Rome to Mazzini, Saffi, and Armellini as "triumvirs," and Mazzini was in reality the master of Rome.² He solemnly proclaimed that the monarchical principle stood condemned, and that the watchword of the future was to be : *Dio e il Popolo.*³

On the day after the establishment of the triumvirate at Rome, a conference was held at Gaëta under the presidency of Cardinal Antonelli, to deliberate on the affairs of Rome and the Papacy. England held aloof from these proceedings. Lord Palmerston, on behalf of his country, had declared that a reconciliation between Pius IX. and his subjects ought to be attempted by peaceful means, and that if an armed intervention were really required, the soldiers who should conduct Pius IX. to Rome ought, in his opinion, to be Italian soldiers, and not foreigners.⁴ He further advised the Pope to assure to his subjects constitutional liberty ; and somewhat later he advised the representative of the Roman Republic in London to make peace with Pius IX. on honourable terms, such as the maintenance of a free Constitution, with liberty of the Press, and complete separation between the spheres of the spiritual and temporal powers. But the English government had long ago abandoned all desire to share in the ordering of Roman affairs. On the other hand, Esterhazy was present on behalf of

¹ Cappelletti, 495. G. Massari : *La vita ed il regno di Vittorio Emanuele II.* (Milano 1880), 23f.

² Farini III, 313f.

³ The programme of the triumvirs in Mazzini : *Scritti editi e inediti* VII, 15f.

⁴ Despatch of 9th March 1849. Bianchi VI, 214.

Austria, Martinez della Rosa of Spain, Count Ludolph of Naples, and the Duke of Harcourt and Count de Rayneval of France.¹

The French envoys insisted, just as Lord Palmerston did, that Pius IX. ought to guarantee to his subjects a free Constitution; but Antonelli asserted that such a demand was an inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of the Papacy, and that the wisdom and justice of the Pope ought to be implicitly trusted. The Austrian, Spanish, and Neapolitan representatives supported him in this, and they seemed ready to act on their own account without waiting for France. But when the French government observed this, they determined to act alone, and to forestall the other powers. It was hoped at Paris that a French army would be well received by the Romans, who were threatened by three reactionary states, and that the French would easily succeed in restoring order at Rome. When that was accomplished, France could demand from the Pope a Liberal government.²

In spite of many difficulties, the French government succeeded in passing a bill in the Legislative Assembly, which granted money for a Mediterranean expedition, and on the 26th April General Oudinot landed with his troops at Cività Vecchia.³ But everything turned out quite differently from what had been expected at Paris. As the French would not give the guarantees of a Liberal tendency which the Roman republicans requested, the latter set about defending themselves, and on the 13th April the French army was beaten back from the walls of Rome, so that the French, instead of a festal entry into the city of St Peter, had to plan a regular siege.⁴

Meanwhile the French envoys at Gaëta continued to request that Pius IX. would promise his subjects a free Constitution; but it was quite clear from Antonelli's answer that, as Pius IX. himself said to Rosmini, the formerly Liberal Pope had now become anti-constitutional and convinced that a free Constitution was incompatible with the spiritual authority of the Papacy.⁵

¹ Bianchi VI, 219f.

² *Ibid.*, 225f.

³ His instructions in Bianchi VI, 227f.

⁴ Farini IV, 17f. The battle was fought at the Porta St Pancrazio and the popular wit therefore gave Oudinot the nickname "St Pancratius."

⁵ See Antonelli's note in Bianchi VI, 238f.

The French Foreign Minister, Drouyn de l'Huys, was indignant at this *ostinazione cardinalizia*, and tried to frighten Antonelli by threatening the papal nuncio at Paris that France would head the Italian movement for liberty, if the Pope stubbornly refused to promise a Constitution. A French army of 20,000 men would then occupy Rome and establish a Liberal government; and if the reactionary friends of the Papacy should think of attacking them they would defend themselves.¹ But Antonelli was not so easily frightened. He knew that the expedition to Rome was anything but favoured by many Frenchmen, and that the Legislative Assembly at Paris was not disposed to vote money for expensive adventures in Central Italy. He stuck to it therefore that the Pope should be brought back to Rome as an absolute sovereign with complete liberty of action; but he admitted that it would be impossible to govern the Papal States as was done before 1846. Nevertheless, no one who read the allocution which Pius IX. addressed to the cardinals on the 20th April,² could doubt that the Papacy now set its hopes on reaction and the reactionary powers. In reference to Austria, Spain, and Naples Pius IX. became cordial and eloquent, but he did not mention the French government; he only spoke of "the clergy and the faithful" in France.³

When the news of the defeat of the French army before Rome reached Paris, the Legislative Assembly demanded that the government should effect the object of the expedition to Italy as quickly as possible, and Ferdinand Lesseps was sent to Rome as diplomatic agent to negotiate with General Oudinot and the Roman triumvirs. The triumvirs declared that, next to the freedom of their own country, nothing was so dear to them as a friendly relation with the French republic, but that they must at all cost preserve the republic at Rome, and that they hated priestly rule.⁴ The mission of Lesseps therefore was entirely unsuccessful. But the republicans of Rome soon discovered that their position was hopeless, and on the night after St Peter's and St Paul's day the French made their way

¹ Bianchi VI, 239.

² Given in Farini IV, 21f.

³ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 87f. Mazzini: *Scritti* VII, 33f.

into Rome.¹ Still the discussions of the Constitution, which the Roman republic was about to create, were not yet ended, and it was not until 3rd July that the new republican Constitution was proclaimed from the Capitol to the listening people.² But on the same day General Oudinot made his entry into the city. The Roman revolution, which had opened tragically with Rossi's murder, now ended in a farce, with the proclamation of the republican Constitution at Rome, at the same moment as Colonel Niel was despatched to Gaëta to surrender to Pius IX. the keys of Rome.

When Rome was subdued, Alexis de Tocqueville, who had succeeded Drouyn de l'Huys as Foreign Minister, remarked to the papal nuncio at Paris: "The French government has paid dearly for the right to advise the Pope."³ The conquest of Rome had cost the French 1,200 men in dead and wounded. But neither the Pope nor the diplomatists at Gaëta appreciated the French sacrifices very highly. Pius IX. expressed his surprise that the French had shown so much clemency towards the inhabitants of the conquered town,⁴ and the announcement made by the Duke of Harcourt, that the French soldiers had conquered the dwelling-place of St Peter for the Pope, was received at the Conference "with striking coldness." When the Duke added, that it would now be best for Pius IX. to return to his capital as soon as possible, Antonelli declared that the Pope himself was of quite another opinion. He intended to entrust the government for the time being to a commission of cardinals. The two French members of the Conference then expressed the hope that Pius IX. would choose princes of the Church who were well suited to the task. But this hope was disappointed. The choice of Pius fell upon Altieri, Della Genga, and Vannicelli. The first had formerly been a Liberal,⁵ but as nuncio at Vienna he had become an

¹ In H. von Moltke: *Gesammelte Schriften* I, 188, is an interesting letter to A. von Humboldt about Rome as a fortress and the plan of attack.

² It is printed in Farini IV, 204.

³ Bianchi VI, 245.

⁴ "Mi sorprese l'udire dal Santo Padre stesso che la condotta dei Francesi padroni di Roma presentava mitezza da non potersi spiegare con tutta chiarezza." Thus the ambassador of Tuscany, Bargagli, wrote on 7th July to the Tuscan Foreign Minister. Bianchi VI, 543.

⁵ Silvagni III, 638.

admirer of Metternich's policy. Della Genga had been one of the leaders of the opposition to Pius IX.'s Liberal concessions,¹ and Vannicelli was a Gregorian of the strictest type. The "red" triumvirate was therefore only fitted to prepare the way for a new form of papal autocracy, and to it General Oudinot on 17th July had to surrender the government of Rome. But it was necessary to show some kind of compliance, and Antonelli explained clearly to the Conference how far the Pope would go.² The main point in Antonelli's speech was that the Pope must definitely insist that a free Constitution was incompatible with his spiritual authority. In the face of this assertion the Austrian ambassador thought right to maintain a respectful silence; and although Martinez della Rosa had himself helped to procure liberty for Spain, even he declared that the Court of Madrid wished to allow St Peter's successor full liberty of action, although it seemed to him personally somewhat precarious entirely to abandon the path of progress. The Neapolitan envoy followed Austria, but the Count de Rayneval, on behalf of France, struck a bold stroke for the freedom of the Papal States. He considered that it would be impossible to induce a people who had tasted the fruits of liberty, to acquiesce without resistance in the loss of the same, and he was convinced that an unconditional opposition to all movements on behalf of liberty would rather hasten than ward off revolutions. To this Antonelli answered, that Pius IX. had appealed to the four powers with a view to getting order re-established in his dominions, and to secure for himself the independence which, for the sake of the Catholic world, he must needs have; and rather than make concessions which were against his conscience, he would brave new dangers. So ended this remarkable Conference.³

Shortly afterwards the President of the French Republic wrote to his friend, Edgar Ney, who was staying in Rome, a letter which attracted great attention. Louis Bonaparte

¹ He had once written a pasquinade, in which he said: "Religion is endangered by this intruded Pope who opposes the will of the Almighty. Heaven will support us against him, since we have also the secular arm, Austria and Naples, on our side." K. Hase: *Werke* III, 2, 742.

² Extract from the protocol of the Conference for 24th July; Bianchi VI, 246f.

³ *Ibid.*, 254.

declared in it that the French republic had not sent an army to destroy the freedom of Rome, but to defend this freedom against excesses. It was now intended to connect proscriptions and tyranny with the return of the Pope, but such could not take place under the shadow of the tricolour. The Pope ought to grant a general amnesty, the secularisation of the administration, the introduction of the *Code Napoléon* and a Liberal government. The President was also much offended because the three cardinals in a manifesto, which they had issued,¹ had neither mentioned the name of France, nor referred to the sufferings of the brave French soldiers.²

Two of the President's ministers, Odilon Barrot and Falloux, were much annoyed on reading this letter, which was first printed in a Florentine paper; it advanced claims which, as they thought, would be destructive to the temporal power of the Holy See. Others scoffed at the idea of this insignificant relative of Napoleon I. going further in effrontery towards the Pope than his great uncle; but Antonelli comforted himself and others with the fact that the President's letter was a purely private document, and not counter-signed by any minister, and therefore of no importance.³ It was in vain that the French diplomatists attempted to wring from Pius IX. the promise of Liberal concessions. The astute Antonelli could not be driven further than to general expressions, which left him full liberty to end that Liberal era which he had himself introduced.⁴ Austria, Spain, and Naples, which as partners in the quadruple intervention had occupied the rest of the Papal States in the course of May and June, could not, and would not, in any way hinder Antonelli.

On 4th September Pius IX. quitted Gaëta, but instead of going to Rome, as the French government had wished, he sailed with the King of Naples to Portici—that is, further south—as a proof that he would not think of returning to Rome before the French had given him an entirely free hand. At Portici, on 12th September, he issued a *Motu proprio*, which contained his programme. He promised the institution of a Council of State (*Consiglio di Stato*), which

¹ The letter of 18th August in Bianchi VI, 258f.

² Farini IV, 246f.

³ Bianchi VI, 261.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 268f.

was to give its opinion on legislative proposals before they were submitted to the sovereign for confirmation, and, at the instance of the Pope and his ministers, to investigate all serious questions regarding administration. A *Consulta di Stato*, the members of which would be chosen by the Pope on the recommendation of the provincial councils, was to take the question of taxes into consideration. The provincial councils (*consigli provinciali*) were also to be chosen by the Pope, but on the proposal of the district councils (*consigli comunali*), which were to be elected by local voters having a certain annual income. Finally, improvements in the transaction of justice and in the penal codes were promised, and a limited amnesty.¹

In order to hide the defeat which French diplomacy had suffered at the Conference of Gaëta, this *Motu proprio* was, as a whole, well received by French politicians. The Foreign Minister, De Tocqueville, endeavoured to prove that it contained the germ or the promise of all the reforms of importance which France had demanded. He forgot that in the *Motu proprio* dated from Portici not the least germ could be discovered of the most important reform of all, namely, the separation of the temporal and spiritual powers, and security for liberty of conscience. Thiers gave the Pope a certificate for being as Liberal now as he was in 1847, and several Roman Catholic orators in the Legislative Assembly amongst others, Montalembert, laboured to prove that the Roman Catholic community had both the right and the duty of keeping the Pope's subjects under a rule which did not grant them the same privileges as other modern nations enjoyed. After a debate of three days the French assembly approved of the *Motu proprio* from Portici.²

Under such circumstances there was no reason for Pius IX. to delay his return to Rome much longer. Antonelli called together the diplomatists who had taken part in the Conference at Gaëta, and who had accompanied Pius IX. to Portici, and told them that the Pope would return to his capital in the hope that by the support of the four powers, and in the attachment of the whole Catholic world, he would have a complete guarantee for his temporal and spiritual rights. On

¹ Farini IV, 271f.

² Bianchi VI, 275f.

4th April Pius IX. left Portici, and approached Rome by way of Terracina and Velletri. On 12th April, shortly after four o'clock in the afternoon, he entered the town through the Porta S. Giovanni.¹ Beside the Pope's carriage rode General, afterwards Field-Marshal, Baraguay d'Hilliers, who had succeeded Oudinot in the command of the French forces, now considerably reduced. Pius IX. drove first to the church of the Lateran, and mounted its broad steps, where the diplomatists stood in a row and kissed his hand. Then he went into the basilica to pray at the high altar, and after that he drove through the crowded streets to St Peter's to pray also at the Apostle's grave. "It was no triumphal reception," says Von Reumont, "but after the enthusiastic shouts with which Pius IX. had formerly been received every time he made his appearance, the reverent behaviour of the multitude was perhaps best." On the evening of the entry there was an unusually fine illumination, and the succeeding days were occupied with festivities of various kinds. But it was now no longer the people who kept festival. Pius IX. certainly heard once more the cry: "*Evviva Pio nono!*" but many were pleased to echo: "*No—no!*" The Pope who now took up his abode in the Vatican was not the same man as the popular Liberal-minded prince who, from the balcony of the Quirinal, had so often received the homage of the people assembled upon Monte Cavallo.

The Romans had for some time mockingly spoken of *Pio nono secondo*,² and when Pius IX. returned to Rome the Italian patriots immediately had reason to observe that a new period of his papacy had commenced.³ When Gavazzi had an audience of the Pope, the conversation began with the Pope's saying to the Barnabite: "Father, I will gladly listen to you, but on condition that you do not mention the word 'Italy.'" "Then," says Gavazzi, "I pointed to the three-coloured cross on my breast, and left him for ever."⁴ The fiery monk at a later

¹ Cp. for the following A. von Reumont: *Aus König Friedrich Wilhelms IV. gesunden und kranken Tagen*, 363f.

² H. von Moltke: *Gesammelte Schriften* I, 25.

³ Cp. Tommaso Tommasoni: *Epoca seconda di Pio IX. e gli uomini del suo governo* (Torino 1855).

⁴ Gavazzi: *Orations* (London 1851) I, 33.

moment became an army chaplain in Garibaldi's camp, and finally evangelical preacher in the little *chiesa libera* by the bridge of S. Angelo.

The stay at Gaëta, which made such a change in the Liberal Pope, had also brought him into close connexion with the followers of Loyola. The expulsion of the Roman Jesuits, as has been already mentioned, had awakened the Pope's deepest sympathy for them. At Gaëta and Portici, Padre Curci had been on intimate terms with the Pope and Antonelli, and he had made both of them to see what a help the order of the Jesuits might be to the Papacy in its struggle against the revolution. On the other hand, Pius IX. had for a long time clearly seen the weaknesses of the older orders—especially of the Dominicans.¹

In January 1850, the Jesuit General, Father Roothaan, had left France and gone to Naples with Father Rozaven, and thence after a short stay in Sicily he had returned to Rome, at the same time as Pius IX.² It had been arranged at Gaëta and Portici that Padre Curci was to publish a Catholic monthly paper, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, beginning in April 1850, in which the most learned members of the order were to deal with all the questions of the day, and all scientific problems, philosophical, historical, political, and economical as well as theological, in order to defend the common interests of the Papacy and the order at every point, and counteract the Reformation and the Revolution in all its forms. Rome had not before possessed such an official organ which could be inspired directly by the Pope. "Even the best friends of the order amongst the Popes, Gregory XIII., Alexander VII., Clement XI., had not gone as far as Pius IX. now did, when he made a sort of *connubium* between the aims and views of the Papacy and those of the Jesuits. And, on the other hand, those who co-operated upon this paper, most willingly appropriated the favourite maxims and aims which Giovanni Maria Mastai had entertained before his elevation, and which he had adhered to in his capacity of Pope."³ Formerly, such a coalition between the Papacy and Jesuitism would have

¹ Purcell: *Cardinal Manning* I, 386f.

² Alberdingk Thijm, 128.

³ Döllinger: *Kleinere Schriften* 582f.

been an impossibility; the other orders would not have tolerated it. But the great monastic orders of the Middle Ages had now dwindled into dwarfs, which, with or against their will, were constrained to serve the Jesuit giant, and Loyola's disciples were again face to face with their old task of being the champions of the counter-reformation and the counter-revolution. In their eyes, the long-abandoned Liberalism of Pius IX. was a *felix culpa*; for it required as its antidote a thorough-going reaction.

Six months after his return (on 29th September 1850), Pius IX. published the bold brief¹ which re-established the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England, while another brief, drawn up at the same time, appointed the former Bishop of Melipotamus and vicar-apostolic, Dr Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, at the head of twelve English suffragans. On the day after the publication of the two briefs, at a secret consistory, the new archbishop was created a cardinal, and on 7th October, Wiseman, as the "Primate of England," sent to his flock, "from the Via Flaminia at Rome," a pastoral letter, which announced the happy event that England had again taken her place amongst well-ordered churches, and "could begin her orbit around the centre of unity and the source of all light and strength." It was the harvest reaped by the Roman Church amongst the priests and laymen whom the Oxford movement had influenced, which made Pius IX. take this step, so mortifying alike to English Protestantism and to the English sense of independence. Even Metternich was doubtful about "this untoward event,"² and in England a No-Popery cry was raised, which showed that the Roman politicians had been far too sanguine and very badly informed when they had expected that "the Anglican schism would come to an end." Lord Winchelsea wrote to the *Times*, that if he had been in office, he would have immediately given the Pope, after such a brief, the choice between the instant revocation of it and war,³ and the Prime

¹ O. Mejer, *Die Propaganda in England* (Leipzig 1851) 171f.

² *Nachgel. Papiere* VIII, 310. The expression was originally used of the battle of Navarino.

³ [J. M. Löbell:] *Historische Briefe über die Verluste des Protestantismus* (Frankfurt 1861), 439.

Minister, Lord John Russell, sent forthwith from Downing Street to Pusey's old tutor, Bishop Maltby, of Durham, a letter full of indignation at the arrogance of Rome, and "the mummeries of High Church superstition."¹ In 1851, the English Parliament passed the Ecclesiastical Titles' Bill, as a repudiation of the Pope's underhand encroachments. It had no effect, and in 1871 it was quietly repealed. But Rome, on the other hand, has found it difficult to conceal the fact that the number of English Roman Catholics, even after the untiring labours of half a century, stands by no means in the right proportion to the large and continually extended hierarchical plant.²

The re-establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England created, as might be expected, great rejoicing amongst the ultramontane Italians; and the joy was increased when Pius IX. succeeded in concluding advantageous Concordats with Spain and Tuscany. By virtue of the former, the Jesuits could again make their entry into the native land of Loyola; by the latter, Josephinism in Tuscany was completely rooted out. Intolerance now obtained so great a power there that the Florentine Francesco Madiari and his wife were in 1852 condemned to four years' penal imprisonment, because they had themselves read an Italian Bible, and had worked for the dissemination of translations of the Bible in their own native language; and they were not released from their confinement until Lord Palmerston threatened to send a few English warships to the Mediterranean. The reaction in Tuscany actually went so far that Leopold II., at the instigation of Rome, forbade the continuation of a new edition of the works of the famous Muratori, because the investigations of the great Modenese historian concerning the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the origin of the Papal States might be a hindrance to the carrying out of the dogmatic schemes of the Jesuits.³ When the free Constitution of Tuscany had been set aside, Leopold II. was able to gladden Pius IX. with the news that he had introduced

¹ H. P. Liddon: *Life of E. B. Pusey* (London 1894) III, 291f.

² J. McCarthy: *A History of our own Times* II, ch. xx. Buddensieg in the *Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift* 1890, 531f.

³ Bianchi VIII, 42f.

into his country a strong system of preventive censorship (*un sistema di censura il più strettamente preventivo*).¹ But neither in Spain nor in Tuscany were the victories of Rome and the reaction of long duration.

When Louis Napoleon, by the *coup d'état* of 2nd December 1851, had assumed the presidential dignity with extended powers, there were many French priests who gave their assent to this step at the plebiscite. The French Catholics noticed with gratitude that the President on his journeys showed his sympathy for the Church, and they thought that he spoke like another Constantine. At Rome they were convinced that the ambitious prince would be obliged to seek the support of the clergy, and that he must therefore show great consideration for the Church. The Abbot of Solesmes, Dom Guéranger, who was at Rome on the occasion of the festival of the conception of the Blessed Virgin on 8th December, wrote of the *coup d'état* which had taken place a few days before: "How true it is that God always preserves to Himself the solution of great crises in the State! For about a week we have every morning offered prayers imploring God's mercy. Amidst all these prayers the rainbow has appeared in the sky, and Rome has discovered it in the very glory of the immaculate Madonna."² There were some French bishops like the old Mgr. de Montals, of Chartres, who would have preferred to see the prince-president, like another Monk, set the legitimate sovereign on the throne of France,³ but most of them made no objection when the prince who was so kindly disposed towards the Church had himself proclaimed Emperor in 1852. They scarcely expected that he would be a Charlemagne, but they hoped, like the influential Catholic journalist, Louis Veuillot, that an attempt might be made to win him without danger and with hope of advantage to the Church.⁴ Mgr. de Ségur assured the Roman politicians that Napoleon III. was becoming more and more devoted to the Pope (*papiste*), and Pius IX. then shut his eyes to the new Emperor's faithless breach of his oath, and to the violences that accompanied the inauguration of the empire.

¹ Bianchi VII, 466. The letter is of 22nd September 1854.

² Baunard : *Histoire du Cardinal Pie, évêque de Poitiers* (Paris 1893) I, 372.

³ Baunard I, 375.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 394.

The successor of St Peter was indeed the first sovereign to congratulate the new Emperor.

It was therefore not surprising that Napoleon III. decided to invite Pius IX. to Paris so that he might be anointed (and shall we say "crowned"?) by his hand; he would thereby in a conspicuous manner follow in his uncle's footsteps, and obtain for his government that halo of legitimacy which it so badly needed. Many of the French bishops supported this project, because they hoped that the Emperor would show his gratitude by abolishing the Organic Articles and compulsory civil marriage,¹ and sanguine persons like Mgr. de Ségur looked upon the coronation of Napoleon III. as "the signing of a treaty of alliance between the Holy See and the empire," and as the best security for the temporal power of the Pope.² But when it came to the point Pius IX. hesitated. The honour of the Papacy, relations to the other Catholic powers, and regard for the French legitimists prevented him from following in the fateful steps of Pius VII., and Metternich can scarcely have been the only person who considered that a journey to crown the imperial adventurer would have compromised the papal dignity both from the moral and from the political point of view.³ But it was the general opinion in Italy that Pius IX. would have liked to comply with the Emperor's invitation.⁴

Meanwhile, affairs at Rome made the greatest caution necessary, for the old dissatisfaction with the papal rule had by no means been eradicated. In 1851 Massimo d'Azeglio wrote to a French friend who had been closely connected with the moderate Liberal Italians: "Rome has now reached the climax of blindness. You have seen this poor country at a time when religious feeling, which had been stifled under the long rule of a bad government, revived with the hope of a better future. But at this moment the government is worse than it was under Gregory XVI.; we have now *la vendetta*

¹ Döllinger: *Kleinere Schriften*, 151f. Reprint from an article in the *Hist.-polit. Blätter* for 1853 on *die Frage der Kaiserkrönung*.

² Baunard I, 395.

³ *Nachgel. Papiere* VIII, 327f.

⁴ Tommasoni wrote to D'Azeglio (*Lettere inedite*, 179): "Credo che Pio nono desidera in suo cuore di fare il viaggio di Parigi, e se la falange degli intriganti e le mene di alcuni diplomatici non gli faranno barriera insormontabile, la spunterà e andrà a fare il Pio VII., forse con maggior fortuna per ora."

pretina in its most disquieting form." Church feeling at Rome was in a poor way. "One of my friends, who is a bishop," wrote Massimo d'Azeglio further, "told me, when he returned from Rome, that one Sunday he celebrated Mass at ten o'clock in S. Andrea della Valle, and that there were not twelve people in that big church! The lower classes have only hatred of the Church in their hearts. All this is sad, very sad; but nothing else could be expected. . . . The expedition to Rome, the clerical reaction, the extravagances of the French Catholic party, the intrigues against England, the foolish war against constitutional institutions and against Piedmont, have made the Pope impotent without foreign help. I do not speak of his temporal power; but his moral authority is destroyed. Poor Pius IX. has been unworthily treated by a gang of swash-bucklers, whom we might with very good reason expel; but we cannot punish the whole country by surrendering it to the opposite sect."¹

It was, as usual, the bad fiscal system that made the papal government detested. While Pius IX. was at Portici, the statutes of the *Banca Romana* had been revised at the suggestion of Antonelli, and in particular a limit had been fixed for the issue of paper money.² During the rule of the red triumvirate, an order had been promulgated that such paper money as had been issued by the Republic was only to be worth sixty-five per cent. of its nominal value, whereby many of the poorer classes in Rome lost thirty-five per cent., if they had not got rid of the republican notes in time. But thanks to the close connexion which the capitalists had with Antonelli,³ it had been resolved that a large loan in paper money, which the *Banca Romana* had made to the Republic, should be repaid to the said bank at its full value. One of Cardinal Antonelli's brothers was a director of the bank; his second brother presided over the authority which arranged the import of corn (*annona*); and the Minister of Finance was a close friend of the Antonelli family. The brothers of the Cardinal Secretary of State could therefore fix the prices of corn, and they made use of their power in such a way that both they themselves and the middle

¹ M. d'Azeglio: *Correspondance politique*, 72.

² Brosch II, 432f.

³ Farini IV, 256.

men amassed large fortunes at the expense of the people. Even from those most closely associated with the Pope, complaints of the bad administration of the finances and predictions of imminent ruin were heard,¹ and the laity groaned under the unjust taxation which laid much heavier burdens upon them than upon the rich clergy.

At first there had been a few laymen in the papal ministry after the return of Pius IX.; but they soon disappeared, and at length the only layman in the ministry was the Minister of War.² Little by little the laymen disappeared also from the governorships, the magistracy, and the higher grade schools, and, in spite of the promises contained in the *Motu proprio* of 12th September, the Pope himself chose the members of the district and provincial councils; Antonelli actually gave orders that the electoral bodies were not to be convened. At the same time the prisons were filled with "suspected" and "ill-disposed" people, and the number of political prisoners had even in 1851 reached 8,800. It was not without reason that Massimo d'Azeglio spoke of *la vendetta pretina*.

Pius IX. himself, however, was scarcely aware how unhappy the state of things had become; he was occupied with something else than finance and politics. While he was in exile at Gaëta, he had turned in his distress to the Queen of Heaven, who in Margotti's words³ "is terrible as an army in battle array." In order to gain her favour, he determined to raise the Immaculate Conception, which, since the time of the great schoolmen, had been a theme of controversy between the Dominicans and Franciscans, from "a pious opinion," into a dogma which all faithful Catholics must accept. In a circular letter, issued on Candlemas Day, 1849, he called to mind that his predecessor in the see of St Peter had received many appeals to define the Immaculate Conception as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, and he asked the bishops to report to him as soon as possible, how much desire there was in their congregations to see the Immaculate Conception elevated to a dogma.

The pious Pope's enthusiasm for the *Conceptio immaculata*

¹ Brosch II, 437f.

² Döllinger: *Kleinere Schriften*, 583.

³ Margotti: *Pius IX.*, 187. [Cp. Cant. VI. 4, 10.]

was shared by the mighty order which was obtaining greater and greater influence. As soon as Father Roothaan returned to Rome, the Pope made a solemn promise on 25th August, the feast of the Immaculate Heart of Mary—a promise which was to benefit the Society of Jesus both temporally and spiritually, for he had determined that not only the Heart of Jesus but also that of Mary should every year be commemorated by the Jesuits with Masses and fasts. The Immaculate Conception had for a long time had in them an army ready for action, and in Loyola's native land, in order to give the disputed proposition greater authority, the members of the order had permitted themselves to make use of one of the strangest frauds with which modern history is acquainted.

In 1588 Ramón de la Higuera and certain other Jesuits at Granada brought to light a metal coffer containing a sheet of parchment and some leaden tablets, which, according to them, constituted a confirmation of the legend that the Apostle James had sojourned in Spain, and apostolic testimony to the Immaculate Conception of Mary. The Dominicans immediately directed a crushing historical criticism against this clumsy forgery; but for a century and a half it was a point of national honour for the Spaniards to believe in the genuineness of these apocryphal documents.¹ However, as early as 1639, Pope Urban VIII. issued a prohibition against any appeal, oral or written, to the *Lammineæ Granatenses*; but the Jesuits, nevertheless, would not give up this fraudulent support of the favourite dogma. Even in 1651, a Jesuit appealed in a sermon in the Roman Professed house to the witness of the Granada tablets in favour of the *Conceptio immaculata*. A Dominican, who had heard the sermon, reported him to the Inquisition, and the Jesuit was compelled to withdraw his words.² The matter was then again submitted to debate, and in 1682, after an investigation which had lasted for twelve years, Innocent XI. put forth a decree which described the tablets of Granada as human forgeries (*figmenta*) calculated to corrupt the Catholic faith.

¹ E. Preuss: *Die römische Lehre von der unbefleckten Empfängniss* (Berlin 1865), 118f. Döllinger: *Akad. Vorträge* I, 249.

² Reusch: *Index* II, 245f.

It might be supposed that no long research was needed in order to reach a right appreciation of the "documents" in question, but Rome was reluctant to wound the national pride of the Spaniards and the mighty order, which felt itself highly compromised when the *Lamminæ plumbeæ et membranæ Granatenses* were finally, in 1682, put on the Index.¹ And as regards the old scholastic point of controversy, Rome hesitated for a long time. In 1617 Paul V. forbade the assertion in sermons, lectures, or theses, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in sin, and Gregory XV. extended the decree to private conversations, though the Dominicans were to be allowed amongst themselves, but not in the presence of strangers, to propound the view of their order, which was against the belief in the Immaculate Conception. Those who would publicly defend the belief, on the other hand, were to abstain from attacking the opinions of the Dominicans, and in the liturgy only the phrase *Conceptio Mariæ immaculatæ* was allowed, not *conceptio immaculata*.

Under Gregory XVI., however, the Papacy, as has been mentioned, had given way on this point, and in spite of Thomas and the Dominicans the doctrine of the *conceptio immaculata* made its way, especially in Spain and Italy.² Hundreds of bishops asked Gregory XVI. to proclaim this dogma by a direct exercise of papal authority; but he hesitated to take such a step. Regard for the order of Dominic did not then count for much, for the order was only a shadow of what it had been. Of greater weight was the circumstance that the definition of this dogma would be a breach with the teaching of former times with regard to the sources of Christian doctrine. By the help of the allegorical exegesis, which the Roman Church employs to so great a degree, it would not have been difficult to find Scriptural authority

¹ *Index libr. prohibitorum*, 178. The brief is of 6th May 1862.

² Varnhagen von Ense (*Tagebuch* II, 72f.), relates, that in May 1842, in a closed "Kritikgesellschaft" at Berlin, where Marheineke, Dove, Bopp, Benary, Gabler and others were present, the conversation turned upon the Immaculate Conception. "Von uns allen," he writes, "wusste nur Marheineke, wie sich die Sache verhält, und auch er nur ungefähr, nicht genau. Entschuldigung der Unkunde. 'Seit mehr als fünfzig Jahren ist das wichtige Thema nicht sonderlich mehr verhandelt worden.' Nur Geduld, es wird schon wieder aufwachen. 'Glauben sie? Ja, wenn nur die Eisenbahnen nicht wären.'"

for the disputed dogma, but as to the proof from tradition there were great difficulties.

Here also, however, Jesuit acumen had found a way out of the dilemma.

In 1847, Giovanni Perrone, then Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the *Collegium Romanum*, published a dissertation, in which he endeavoured to prove that neither Bible nor tradition is necessary for the definition of a dogma.¹ It is sufficient to suppose a secret tradition residing in the ministry of the Church and in the general consciousness of the faithful, until at length, at some time or other, it makes its appearance before the public. If this were not the case, not a few dogmas, Perrone thought, must of necessity be looked upon as having recently arisen, and it must be said of them that they only met with credence at a comparatively late date. Döllinger is undoubtedly right when he says that this theory of tradition would in the days of Gallicanism have been looked upon "als eine grundstürzende Häresie," which fully justified the Protestant accusations against Rome. But in spite of everything it pursued its way victoriously. The power of Gallicanism was broken, and German theology dared not make any serious objection. The German Catholic theologians for a moment thought of holding a meeting to show the Pope that a definition of dogma could not be arrived at in the manner suggested by Perrone; but they did not carry out the intention. The theological faculties of Munich and Tübingen were asked to send in a report on the subject, and their opinion was against Perrone's new theory. But as by that time there could no longer be any doubt that the Pope meant to assume to himself authority to decree a dogma, it was too late to raise objections.

Most of the pronouncements which came in from foreign bishops were, of course, such as the Pope and the Jesuits desired;² but prelates like Sibour, Archbishop of Paris, could not refrain from expressing their surprise that Rome should care to define a dogma without any constraining necessity,

¹ *De immaculato B. V. Mariæ conceptu an dogmatico decreto definiri possit* (Roma 1847). Cp. Döllinger: *Das Papstthum*, 252f.

² All the 620 answers are collected in *Parèri dell' episcopato sulla definizione dogmatica dell' Immacolato Concepimento* (Roma 1851) I—III.

and they gave their advice against such a step.¹ Side by side with these expressions of caution the wildest outburst of enthusiasm made itself heard. The Archbishop of Trani hailed the forthcoming definition of the new dogma with the greatest delight, because it would thereby be made clear that Mary is a complement of the Holy Trinity and the "Co-redemptress" of the world;² and from Spain came the information that all Spanish bishops from the first beginnings of the Church (*ab ipsis Ecclesiæ incunabulis*) had believed in the Immaculate Conception.³

After receiving these replies, Pius IX. appointed a dogmatic commission, consisting of the theologians, Caterini, Audisio, Perrone, Passaglia, Clemens Schrader, Spada, and Tonnini, which approved of Perrone's theory of tradition, in that it declared that tradition by itself, without the evidence of Scripture, is sufficient for the definition of a dogma, and that the existence of a Catholic tradition has been proved when from one age or another a certain number of clear witnesses for it can be produced.⁴

After this pronouncement Pius IX. invited about forty bishops to "the holy city" in order that their presence might add lustre to the proclamation of the dogma, and about a hundred other bishops came to Rome without invitation. All the bishops who came took part in four meetings which were held at the Vatican (20th-24th November). At the first of these meetings Cardinal Brunelli delivered a Latin oration from which the bishops learned that Pius IX. rejoiced greatly to see them assembled in the city of St Peter "to be present"

¹ Sibour wrote: "Nunquam Ecclesia doctrinæ punctum quodlibet ex frigido, ut ita dicam, nulla fervente controversia, nulla urgente necessitate, et sola definiendi voluptate sancivit. Unde vero hæc definiendi voluptas?"

² "Enim vero per illud clarius et abundantius elucent veritates, quomodo ipsa Dei filia nobilissima et singularis sponsa Dei æterna et immaculata, nec non Trinitatis complementum evaserit, insuperque corredemptricis nomen et gloriam promeruerit" I, 9f.

³ It was the Bishop of Barbastro, who ventured upon this assertion.

⁴ "Il faut avouer, que la tradition catholique est prouvée, lorsqu'on peut constater l'assentiment général de l'église à une époque quelconque, ou produire un certain nombre de témoignages décisifs qui le supposent." Preuss, 134, after Malou: *L'immaculée conception de la bienheureuse vierge Marie considérée comme dogme de foi* (Bruxelles 1857) I—II. Bishop Malou of Bruges was himself present at the meeting of bishops at Rome.

at the definition of the privilege of the most Blessed Virgin.¹ They must not, however, think that they were a council, and they must not themselves discuss the question or express an opinion as to how far the moment was opportune for bringing the matter forward; it was the Pope's business to settle such a question. After that, the secretary of the meeting read the Bull aloud, paragraph by paragraph, and those present made a few mild remarks. One was of opinion that it was rather too much to say that the Bible taught the Immaculate Conception; another had scruples about finding patristic support for it in spurious writings of St Ambrose and St Augustine. Some would have preferred to see the whole "commentary" done away with, because it contained several weak points; others were of opinion that the wishes and the conclusion of the episcopate ought to be mentioned—a humble attempt to put a limit to the assertion of the Infallibility of the Pope, which was at the bottom of the whole proceeding. All these objections were met by the answer that "it was a practical demonstration," if the Papacy alone took such an important decision; for thereby the "sovereign power of the Church" was revealed, and "the infallibility with which Jesus Christ has invested His vicar upon earth." At length the criticisms were silenced, and at the last meeting (24th November) an unanimous chorus was heard from the assembled bishops: "Holy Peter, teach us; strengthen thy brethren!" And the "deliberations" were at an end.

On 8th December 1854, the new dogma was solemnly proclaimed. It is related² that, at the last moment, Pius IX., timid and hesitating, delayed to go down into St Peter's church; but the Jesuit, Padre Passaglia, who had strongly pushed for the definition of the dogma, stepped in to the anxious Pope, and exhorted him to do his duty. Pius IX. then entered the church and mounted his throne, round which the cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops had taken their places. As soon as Mass was finished, Cardinal Macchi, followed by the patriarch of the Uniat Greeks, and by the Armenian

¹ "Vobis magno cum nostro gaudio adstantibus et plaudentibus Divino adjuvante Spiritu pronuntiavimus," said Pius IX. on 9th December 1854 in the allocution to the bishops. Friedrich: *Geschichte des vatikanischen Konzils* I, 338.

² Silvagni III, 584.

patriarch, presented himself before the throne, and falling on his knees, begged Pius IX. to fulfil the wishes of the Catholic Church, and by his infallible word to confirm the Immaculate Conception of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary as an article of faith.¹ In answer to this request Pius IX. intoned the *Veni Creator*, and when it was finished, he read the main part of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*.² It contained the following passage: "In honour of the holy and undivided Trinity, to the glory of the Virgin Mother of God, to the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Christian religion, in accordance with authority from our Lord Jesus Christ, from the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and from ourselves, we declare, proclaim, and decree that the doctrine which teaches that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first moment of her conception, by a special gift of grace from Almighty God, in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved pure from all taint of original sin, is revealed by God, wherefore it shall also be the object of sure and certain faith on the part of all believers. If therefore, any—which God forbid!—should dare to think otherwise in their heart, than as we have determined, they shall learn and know, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck of the faith, and are separated from the unity of the Church, and that further they are liable by their own act to the punishments fixed by law, if they presume orally or in writing, or in any other outward way, to make known what they think in their hearts."

The Abbé Darboy, afterwards Archbishop of Paris, who was present during the reading, wrote in his diary that the face of Pius IX. was illumined by a heavenly radiance, *une visible effusion de l'Esprit de Dieu*,³ and the enthusiasm among less critical natures was great. The more critical were somewhat surprised that the Bull concerning the new dogma was not made public until the middle of January 1855. To meet the wishes of many, corrections needed to be made in the official text after the solemn promulgation.⁴ Pius IX. found these

¹ Friedrich I, 338, after *Würzburger Kathol. Wochenschrift*, 1854, 911f.

² Printed in the *Lettres apostoliques de Pie IX.* etc., 124.

³ Foulon: *Histoire de Monseigneur Darboy* (Paris 1889), 163.

⁴ Flir: *Briefe aus Rom* (Innsbruck 64), 23.

changes in the "infallible word" somewhat embarrassing, but consoled himself with the thought that the corrections in the Bull would at any rate show that the Jesuits were not absolute masters at Rome.¹

The proclamation of the new dogma on the strength of the Pope's absolute discretion was an event of extraordinary importance, which was bound to awaken attention everywhere in the world of Catholic theology. "It is," wrote the Jesuit Clemens Schrader in 1865, "an act peculiar to the pontificate of Pius IX., and one to which no former pontificate can show any parallel; for the Pope has defined this dogma independently, and of his own sovereign authority, and without the co-operation of a council; and this independent definition of a dogma involves, if not expressly and formally, yet none the less undoubtedly and practically, another dogmatic decision, namely, the settlement of the controverted question, whether the Pope is infallible in his own person in matters of faith, or if he can only lay claim to this infallibility when at the head of a council. Pius IX., by his action on 8th December 1854, did not indeed theoretically define, but practically claimed infallibility for the Pope."² In other words, the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary was a pilot balloon for the definition of the Pope's Infallibility.

And there seemed to be much to encourage Pius IX. to proceed further on the road of infallibility. Wherever there were Jesuits, loud acclamations of joy were heard. Queen Isabella, in token of her ecstasy, sent the Pope a tiara with 18,000 brilliants and 500 precious stones to the value of 2,000,000 of reals. At Vienna the whole Court and the life-guards went in solemn procession to the marble column in honour of Mary, which Ferdinand III. had erected in 1647, when he chose the *Mater immaculata* as the protectress of Austria.³ At Naples the new dogma was published to the forces in an army order, and saluted with firing of guns. In Italy, Germany, and Spain, medals were struck and monuments

¹ He said: "Questo è una mortificazione per Roma, ma è bisogno di soffrirla, affinché non si dica, che tutto sia dipendente dai Gesuiti." Flir, 25.

² [Cl. Schrader]: *Pius IX. Als Papst und als König*, 12. This work is accompanied by "ein Päpstliches Belobungsschreiben."

³ Cardinal Rauscher's sermon on this occasion is found in his *Hirtenbriefe, Predigten, Anreden* (Vienna 1860), 422f.

erected in honour of the Immaculate Conception,¹ and there was no end to the processions and pastoral letters occasioned by the new dogma.² On 30th December 1854, the galley slaves of Rome dragged a large antique column of green marble to the Piazza di Spagna, and two years later a richly gilt statue of the Blessed Virgin (without the Holy Child) was unveiled on the top of it. In 1857 the memorial was completed³ by the erection of four white marble figures, Moses, David, Isaiah, and Ezekiel, who, according to the allegorical exegesis of the Roman Church, are said to have prophesied of the Immaculate Conception.⁴ Pius IX. had also a copper tablet placed in the wall of St Peter's church, which was to announce to later generations that in proclaiming this dogma he had fulfilled the wish of the whole of Catholic Christendom (*totius orbis catholici desideria explevit*); and the Vatican, besides, has now a *Sala dell' Immacolata*, in which the promulgation of the new dogma is glorified in a large and gaudy but spiritless fresco painting, which looks like a chromo-lithograph by the side of Raphael's *stanze*.

But the dogma of the *Conceptio immaculata* met also with opposition. In the year 1850 the French priest, Jean-Joseph Laborde, in the diocese of Auch, had written a book on the Immaculate Conception, which was put on the Index.⁵ Not disheartened by this, Laborde, in the following year, published his book in a slightly altered form; and in 1854 he travelled to Rome to oppose the definition of the new dogma. He was immediately imprisoned, and in the course of a few days sent home by the Roman police. As he would not submit even after the proclamation, Sibour had to forbid him to say Mass, and he died shortly after in the workhouse. But over his grave on Mont Parnasse is raised a stone with the inscription, *Avorum fidei tenax devitansque profanas vocum novitates*. And Laborde was not the only French priest who withstood

¹ This was done at Trent in 1855 at the tercentenary of the famous Council.

² Friedrich I, 339.

³ F. Gregorovius: *Römische Tagebücher* (Stuttgart 1892), 21, 43, 47.

⁴ As regards Ezekiel, we are referred to chap. xliv. 2: "Then said the Lord unto me, This gate (*i.e.*, the Eastern gate in the outer court) shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut."

⁵ Reusch: *Index* II, 1153f.

the new dogma. In the days of the July monarchy, French Jansenists had attacked Mariolatry in the *Revue ecclésiastique*, and in 1856, in the *Observateur Catholique*, the Abbé Guettée took up arms against the new dogma.¹ In Austria a priest in the diocese of Passau made a protest against the papal Bull; and even in Spain a Dominican, Carrillo, formerly professor at Alcalá, dared to criticise the action of Pius IX. But both the Spanish Dominican and the Austrian priest, who ended by fighting for a Catholic Church without a pope, were immediately rendered harmless, and had to suffer much for their conviction; but the dislike for the new dogma smouldered for some time in many places. On 3rd January 1857, when Archbishop Sibour was walking at the head of a procession in the church of St Étienne du Mont,² he was assailed by an excommunicated priest, who murdered him with the exclamation, "Away with Goddesses!" The dagger of the fanatical priest struck an innocent man, for Sibour had done what he could to avert the proposed definition.

In the year following the assassination of Sibour, the new dogma was confirmed in a way which, in the eyes of many believing Catholics, made an end of all contradiction. On 11th February 1858, "a white lady" appeared in the cave of Massabielle to a girl of fourteen, called Bernadette Soubirous, and when the young girl had repeatedly seen the white figure with a rosary in its folded hands, she took courage, and on 15th March asked who it was that she saw. The figure answered in French: "I am the Immaculate Conception." After a commission of investigation had come to the conclusion that the thing was a miracle, the cave in the rocky hill of Massabielle became a much-frequented place of pilgrimage. The *Vierge immaculée de Lourdes* soon became famous for her miracles, and in 1876 the papal nuncio solemnly crowned the Madonna's statue in the grotto of Lourdes.³

After the Immaculate Conception was elevated to a dogma, a new impetus was given to the May devotions, which the Jesuits and the Redemptorists had long held. "This May

¹ Séché: *Les derniers Jansénistes* III, 26f.

² Foulon: *Hist. de Monseigneur Darboy*, 190f.

³ A. Loth: *Le miracle en France au dix-neuvième siècle* (Paris 1894), 164f.

devotion," says a modern Roman Catholic author,¹ "was looked upon as a sort of mission of the material world. In this month Mary, by the glorious re-awakening of Nature, by the warming rays of the sun, by the fragrant flowers, by the joyous song of the birds, and by the clearness of the sky, calls us to the praise of God and to the deepest and sincerest adoration of the Most High, and also to the conversion of the heart. . . . She is, indeed, the connecting link between God and man, the way to the heart of God (*der Weg zum Herzen Gottes*)." In May 1856 one of the most popular clergymen of Vienna, to the sound of kettle-drums and trumpets, delivered an animated sermon upon the Loretto litany in St Stephen's Church, as an introduction to the May devotions in the capital of Austria, and from that time onwards these devotions became fashionable in Austria.

While the theologians and clergy of the Roman Church were occupied with the new dogma, the sceptical Secretary of State was conducting important political negotiations with Austria. The reaction against the March revolution had given the bishops of the Empire bright hopes of deliverance from the yoke of Josephinism, and Pius IX., whilst at Gaëta, had already expressed his expectation, that Austria would abandon certain principles, which the Apostolic See had always rejected. As usual, the marriage laws were in this case the sore point; if an Austrian priest refused to bless a marriage contracted according to the laws of the State, a severe punishment was in store for him.

On 2nd December 1851, the young Emperor, Francis Joseph, who had been taught philosophy² by Joseph Othmar Rauscher, at that time Prince-Bishop of Seckau, and sixteen months later Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, sent to his Minister of Public Worship, Count Thun, a letter, in which he asked that the Austrian marriage laws should be brought into accord with the precepts of the Catholic Church.³ Thus the negotiations were opened, which under Rauscher's able guidance led to a Concordat, dated 18th August 1855, which

¹ L. Donin : *Eine Lebensskizze* (Wien), 41f.

² But not, as first intended, canon law, because Rauscher was too High Church.

C. Wolfgruber : *Cardinal Rauscher* (Freiburg 1888), 55.

³ Wolfgruber, 134f.

immediately evoked the greatest dislike amongst Austrian Liberals, because it looked like a piece of the Middle Ages, which had strayed into our time.¹ The Roman Curia, which had been taught by Napoleon I. to use French, here again used Latin, and Rome had extorted great concessions from the young sovereign. "The Catholic religion," so runs Article I., "with all the rights, which, according to God's ordinance and the Church's laws, it ought to enjoy, shall always be maintained in the whole empire of Austria, and in all the countries of which it is composed."² The ministers of the Church shall have a right to turn freely to the head of the Roman Church, and the imperial consent shall no longer be necessary when a Bull is to be published. But the Pope, "out of regard to the circumstances of the time," will allow purely secular affairs (such as contracts, debts, and legacies), even when they concern ecclesiastics, to be brought before the secular tribunals.³ But there were other articles which fully compensated for these concessions. The charge of education, both secondary and elementary, and to a certain extent also the censorship of the Press, came into the hands of the bishops. It was therefore no wonder that Pius IX. called Francis Joseph "great in everything," or that Cardinal Rauscher, in a pastoral letter to his diocese, designated the new Concordat as a solemn proclamation of "the Christian state."⁴ And the authors of the Concordat were not content to stop at the empire.⁵ In old Habsburgian fashion, they immediately thought of bringing other German states under the lead of the Viennese Court by spreading the idea of concordats, and shortly after, similar agreements were made with Würtemberg and Baden.

What was it that could move a sovereign like Francis Joseph to carry concessions to Rome so far? The influence of Rauscher has sometimes been given as the reason, sometimes

¹ Cp. L. Reyscher: *Das östreich. und das würtemb. Concordat* (Tübingen 1868) and [J. M. Lobell]: *Historische Briefe*, 473f.

² Reyscher, 94.

³ Art. XIII. Cp. XI. and XV. In a secret article the imperial government obtained the right to proceed against a bishop who was guilty of high treason or *lèse majesté*.

⁴ Rauscher: *Hirtenbriefe*, 446f.

⁵ [Löbell]: *Historische Briefe*, 475.

the eloquence of the papal nuncio, Cardinal Viale Pella, or the young Emperor's want of clear perception of the extent of the concessions. But one more explanatory circumstance must yet be mentioned: Austria needed something binding which would hold the heterogeneous empire together,—a compact with an authority that would be obeyed on the Po, the Danube, and the Moldau. This authority could only be found in the Roman Church; but Rome does not lend her arm for nothing. The altar that is to sustain the throne must be honoured and gilded. Francis Joseph could safely trust himself to Rome, for the Papacy had entirely broken with Liberalism. And for Pius IX. an alliance with Austria was much to be desired, because in the Empire he would find his best coadjutor in combating the ideas of liberty and unity which had found refuge in Piedmont.

In the speech from the throne with which Victor Emmanuel opened Parliament at Turin on 30th July 1849, he hinted that such alterations ought to be made in the civil and criminal laws, that all Piedmontese citizens might be equal before the law.¹ In these words he had especially in view the abolition of the Church's right of jurisdiction over the clerics. In order to induce the Papacy to make concessions on this point, he sent Count Siccardi to Portici, but the Count accomplished nothing. Pius IX. and Antonelli would not give up the least fraction of the mediæval privileges of the clergy, and when Siccardi took leave of the papal Secretary of State, the latter declared that the Holy Father, to please the King of Sardinia, was willing to go to the devil's threshold, but beyond that he could not go.²

In spite of Rome's unyielding attitude, Siccardi soon afterwards, as Minister of Justice, laid a proposal before the Sardinian Parliament for the abolition of the Church's right of jurisdiction over the clergy, and of the right of asylum; for the restriction of the many holy days, and so forth; and after a long debate these proposals were carried. Archbishop Franzoni, of Turin, however, would not comply with the new laws, and he even commanded a priest in the town to refuse the last sacrament to Santa Rosa, the Minister of

¹ Massari: *La vita ed il regno di Vittorio Emanuele II. di Savoia*, 73f.

² Massari, 96.

Commerce, who had spoken and voted for the new laws. Against this defiance the government took action. Franzoni was first imprisoned and afterwards banished; and when the Archbishop of Cagliari made common cause with him, he suffered a similar fate. It was of no avail that Victor Emmanuel sent Pinelli, the chairman of the Chamber of Deputies, to Rome, in order to bring about a better understanding. At Rome, Victor Emmanuel was looked upon as a sacrilegious person, and it was counted a further proof of his impiety that he appointed Count Cavour, who had gained his first parliamentary laurels in defending the *legge Siccardi*,¹ to be Santa Rosa's successor.

Although Cavour had very soon to resign, Pius IX. could no longer feel safe. In 1852 the Chamber of Deputies passed a civil marriage law, which gave the greatest offence at Rome. As it also awakened religious scruples in the mind of Victor Emmanuel, it was withdrawn before it had passed the Senate. "I must think of the heavenly side of things," said Victor Emmanuel, when the Minister of Justice propounded to him the legal and political reasons for the Bill.² Discouraged by the King's attitude towards this question, Massimo d'Azeglio, who was then Prime Minister, retired, and Cavour became president of a reconstructed Cabinet, and at the same time Minister of Finance. Shortly afterwards he became also Minister for Foreign Affairs, and as such, on 10th January 1855, he concluded the agreement with England and France regarding the participation of Sardinia in the Crimean War, which laid the foundation of Italian unity.

Immediately after this step heavy sorrows fell upon Victor Emmanuel; in less than two months he lost his mother, his consort, and his brother, the Duke of Genoa. Whilst he was bowed down by these losses, religious passions were again stirred. Rattazzi laid before the Chambers a Monastery Bill, according to which all monasteries and religious institutions which were not occupied with studies, education, or nursing the sick, would be abolished. Pius IX. immediately condemned the bill in a vehement allocution to the cardinals, and complained bitterly of all the trials which the Church had to

¹ G. Massari: *Il conte di Cavour* (Torino 1873), 53f.

² Massari: *Vittorio Emanuele II*, 141.

undergo in Sardinia. The Piedmontese episcopate attempted to avert the passing of the bill by offering the government a large sum of money which would help it over the economic difficulties which were anticipated.¹ Once more the bishops sought to frighten the King from confirming this "impious" law, and in the streets of Turin the mob, incited by the priests, called Victor Emmanuel "a robber." The tension between the clerical and the national party became so great that a ministerial crisis occurred, during which an attempt was made to reconcile the interests of the Church and the country in a different way. But the attempt failed, and the Monasteries Bill was then passed with a few alterations by the Senate as well as by the Chamber of Deputies, whilst the offer of the bishops, with their conditions attached to it, was rejected as insulting to the State. Pius IX. replied to the bill by the allocution of 26th July 1855, in which he pronounced the greater excommunication upon all those who had promulgated or favoured the decrees hostile to the Church, and affairs in Sardinia were now so painful that Cavour said to a friend that he would rather go to America than ever touch matters of that kind again.²

Side by side with these serious disturbances at home, the battle raged round Sebastopol; and when Cavour, after the termination of the war in the East, was admitted to the Congress at Paris in 1856, he advocated the cause of Italy. He proposed to Napoleon III. that he should induce the Austrians to retire from the Legations and Romagna, and should give over these provinces to a lay sovereign, or in any case secure to them a lay government.³ The expedient came to his mind that the Pope should retain his sovereignty over the Legations, but should allow them to be administered by a vicegerent, chosen for ten years or for life. But he left the Congress with the conviction that Austria would never give up her system of repression, and that the Italian question could not be solved by diplomatic means.

During the debate in the Congress about the Italian cause, the English representative, Lord Clarendon, allowed himself to be so carried away as to use the expression that the papal

¹ Massari: *Cavour*, 120f.

² *Ibid.*, 124.

³ N. Bianchi: *Il conte Camillo di Cavour. Documenti editi e inediti* (Torino 1863), 35f.

government was "a scandal to Europe," and he, at least, fully understood Cavour's hint that a declaration of war on the part of Sardinia against Austria was an imminent possibility.¹ In order to discount the words of Lord Clarendon, the French ambassador at Rome, Count Rayneval, in a note of 14th May 1856, undoubtedly inspired by Antonelli, attempted a complete defence of the situation at Rome. If Count Rayneval might be believed, Pius IX. had fulfilled all the demands which his subjects could reasonably make, and their dissatisfaction was therefore only to be ascribed to the Italian national character, which was always discontented.² Count Rayneval did not, however, escape contradiction. Lord Lyons pointed out that the optimistic judgment of the French ambassador was due to influences from the Vatican, where it was desired that France should continue to give the see of St Peter armed help. But he, too, passed a severe judgment upon the Italians. There were, according to him, only two sorts of people in the Papal States: irreconcilable enemies of the government, who would not put up with a priestly rule, and could not be won over by single reforms, because they hoped for a thorough revolution—and the indifferent, dull, and untrustworthy citizens who would be unable to give the government any real support at a decisive moment. Lord Lyons was convinced that the inferior papal officials were themselves discontented with the papal government, and he characterised them as being lazy and open to be bribed.

In order to show the world that in the disputed provinces there still existed a great devotion to the Papacy, Antonelli seized upon the old device of getting the successor of St Peter to make a tour through them. From May to September 1857 Pius IX. was away from Rome, and in that period he visited especially Bologna, Imola, and Ravenna.³ On the journey he had interviews with Minghetti and Pasolini, and to the latter he declared that important alterations in the government were not to be thought of.⁴ His two Liberal ministers seemed to him now incorrigible visionaries, and they on their part grieved that there was scarcely one honest man in the Pope's

¹ Bianchi: *Cavour*, 39.

² Brosch II, 441f. Pasolini, 200f.

³ Silvagni III, 586f.

⁴ Pasolini, 206f.

surroundings, and that a great many of those who stood nearest to him had obtained his favour by ministering to his hatred of Liberalism. Pius IX., of course, only saw what he was allowed to see. Not even petitions might be handed to him without the contents having been previously examined; and applications with regard to such innocent things as a telegraph line or petty remissions in the custom duties were simply refused.¹ The rejoicings were only moderate; but when Pius IX. returned to Rome he was received with triumphal arches and illuminations. "The Pope," wrote Gregorovius in his diary on the day of the Pope's return, "beams with contentment and pleasure. He believes that he is adored by his people, as in old days."²

While Pius IX. was on this tour, the noble Venetian, Daniel Manin, formed in Paris an Italian National Association, which was to support the house of Savoy in its efforts to form an united Italy. Cavour for the present only contemplated the establishment of a North-Italian kingdom, but the members of the new association, which, after Manin's death, was headed by the Sicilian, La Farina, had much more daring aspirations. Like the Piedmontese minister, however, they abhorred the Mazzinian policy of conspiracy and violence; they especially put their trust in the third Napoleon's old love of Italy, and in the Italians' growing hatred of Austria.

Accordingly, the attempt of Felice Orsini upon Napoleon's life on 14th January 1858 caused the greatest horror in their ranks, and it seemed for a time as if the bombs of the Mazzinians would completely estrange the French Emperor from the Italian patriots. After that attempt Napoleon, in his indignation, demanded that the Piedmontese Press should be held in check, and Cardinal Antonelli rejoiced to see that nearly everywhere on the continent of Europe Piedmont was looked upon as the home and focus of Italian revolution. But his joy was only short-lived. Cavour proved in a despatch³ to the Sardinian envoy at Rome, which was afterwards communicated to all friendly governments, that it was the Pope and his ministers who contributed the largest contingent to the revolution, by driving hundreds of his Holiness's subjects into exile,

¹ Brosch II, 439.

² Gregorovius: *Römische Tagebücher*, 49.

³ Of 11th February 1858. Bianchi VII, 661f. Cp. 401.

who, stripped of everything, had no other course open to them than to cast themselves upon the political sects. In a later despatch¹ Cavour endeavoured to show the foreign Courts that it was in the interest of Europe at large to remove the main sources of discontent in Italy, viz.: bad government in the Papal States, and in Naples, and the preponderating influence of Austria in the country. Thereupon Napoleon's anger and disquietude soon abated, and, on 20th July 1858, Cavour met the French Emperor secretly at Plombières. The conversation lasted eight hours, and agreements of far-reaching importance were arrived at.² Napoleon III. promised to help Victor Emmanuel if his country were attacked by Austria; and, if the fortunes of war favoured the two sovereigns, the house of Savoy was to rule over a kingdom stretching from the Alps to the Adriatic Sea with 12,000,000 inhabitants, while France obtained Nice and Savoy. Napoleon concealed the agreement of Plombières from everybody, even from his own Foreign Minister, and Cavour was not allowed to reveal the secret to anyone but his King. Neither at Rome nor at Vienna was there any suspicion of what had happened at Plombières.

An event occurred shortly after the meeting at Plombières, which threw a vivid light upon affairs in the Papal States. A Christian nurse who served in the house of a Jew named Mortara, at Bologna, had, without the consent of the parents, secretly christened their little son Edgardo Mortara; and when the priests got to know of it, they took the child from the parents without further ceremony, and brought him to Rome to the *palazzo* for neophytes at Rione Monti, to bring him up as a Christian. Cavour directed the attention of the foreign governments to this offence against parental rights and freedom of conscience,³ and there went up a cry of indignation all over Europe. But in spite of the entreaties of the father, and remonstrances from many quarters, Rome kept fast hold upon the baptised little Jew, and Edgardo Mortara became in the course of years a fanatical Catholic, who not long ago (in 1893), at a Catholic congress at Würzburg, praised his adoptive father,

¹ Of 1st April 1858. Bianchi: *Cavour*, 55f. Brosch II, 446.

² Massari: *Cavour*, 244f. Bianchi: *Cavour*, 57f.

³ Massari: *Cavour*, 257.

Pius IX., because he gave the old answer *Non possumus* to all demands for the surrender of his adopted son.

It was not long before it became clear to everybody what had been arranged at Plombières. At the New Year's levée in 1859, Napoleon III. said to the Austrian ambassador, Baron Hübner, that he was sorry that the relations with the Austrian government were not as good as formerly; and a few days later, Victor Emmanuel announced to the Sardinian chambers, that Prince Napoleon wished to contract a marriage with his daughter, the Princess Clotilde. The prospect of a breach with Austria, and an alliance with Piedmont, caused a great stir amongst French Catholics, who immediately suspected that Rome was in danger.¹ Count de Falloux wrote an article in the *Correspondant*, in which he showed that those who would urge France to war with Austria were friends neither of the French empire nor of Italy, but accomplices of the demagogues of Europe. The hearts of all Catholic Frenchmen, according to him, beat warmly for the freedom of Italy, but they were afraid of its unity, which would destroy the sovereignty of the Pope.²

In the beginning of February an anonymous pamphlet was published, called *Napoléon III. et l'Italie*, which, on account of the review of it in the *Moniteur*, must be supposed to be an expression of the Emperor's designs. The author, the Vicomte de la Guéronnière, advocated the liberation of Italy by a foreign power, and the formation of an Italian federation under the presidency of the Pope; and he recommended changes in the Roman government, which might be calculated to bind St Peter's successor closer to his subjects, and to make possible the establishment of a native army for his defence. A few days later, on 7th February, the speech from the throne at the opening of the Chambers contained the statement that the condition of Italy, and especially the circumstance that order could only be maintained by foreign troops, gave diplomacy an uneasiness which was not groundless; still the Emperor expressed the hope that peace might not be disturbed. Two weeks later, Pius IX. declared his readiness to enter into negotiations with Austria and France,

¹ F. Lagrange: *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup* (Paris 1894) II, 201.

² Lagrange II, 198. De Falloux: *Mémoires d'un royaliste* (Paris 1888) II, 302f.

in order to free the Roman territory as quickly as possible from French and Austrian troops;¹ but at Paris no notice was taken of this declaration.

85 On 30th April the final breach occurred between Piedmont and Austria, and in the first days of May a French auxiliary army was landed at Genoa, while another was on its way over the Alps. Although Napoleon III., in his proclamation of 3rd May,² gave the assurance that he would neither promote anarchy nor overthrow the power of the Pope, whom he had himself replaced upon the throne, and although the French Minister of Public Worship promised the bishops that all the sovereign rights of the Pope should be respected, the French Catholics were, nevertheless, anything but easy, and the Italian war had momentous results for the temporal power of the Pope. Nobody could doubt that the Vatican was on the side of Austria. The Austrian government had for a long time impressed on the Roman government that "Italy was the enemy of the Church"; and it was in vain that Padre Ventura appealed to Cardinal Antonelli to warn the Roman priesthood against showing sympathy with Austria.³ The papal provinces, on the other hand, followed the march of the united armies with the most intense interest. The news of the victory of Magenta set Romagna in commotion, and when the Austrians withdrew their troops from Bologna on the night between 11th and 12th June, the papal arms were immediately taken down from the public buildings, and in the streets was heard the shout: "Long live Victor Emmanuel!" The papal legate, Cardinal Milesi, sent a message to the municipality, and asked if they could guarantee that the town should remain quiet. He received an answer in the negative, and immediately left his post.⁴

On 13th June the revolution broke loose at Ravenna. As soon as the Gonfaloniere of the town, Count Pasolini, had conducted the papal legate, Mgr. Ricci, to Classe, a provisional Giunta was established at Ravenna,⁵ and thence the revolution spread to Bologna, where likewise a provisional

¹ Foisset: *Vie du R. P. Lacordaire* (Paris 1873) II, 404.

² Foisset II, 405.

³ M. d'Azeglio: *Correspondance politique*, 96.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁵ Pasolini, 230f.

government was chosen, which handed over the dictatorship of the town to Victor Emmanuel. In a moment the whole of Romagna was in revolt, and on 15th June Massimo d'Azeglio, whose name was a standard to the inhabitants of Romagna, was appointed to be the commissioner of the Piedmontese government in the disturbed province.¹ It was in vain that Pius IX., in an encyclical of 18th June, expressed his indignation at "the impudent sacrilege," and threatened with the major excommunication anyone who dared to attack the temporal power of the Papacy. Even Rome was divided into two great parties—an ecclesiastical and a national—and the national party rejoiced over the progress of the revolution, and mourned when a regiment of the papal Swiss guard succeeded in quelling the revolution at Perugia. On that occasion, moreover, so many violences occurred, that the greatest indignation was everywhere felt against the papal government.² "The Romans are exasperated," Gregorovius wrote in his diary; and when the news of the Austrian defeat at Solferino was received at Rome, many people put up illuminations in their windows. Some days afterwards Pius IX. summoned the cardinals to a consistory, and delivered an allocution in which he threatened the rebels in the Papal States with excommunication, but without mentioning the King of Sardinia. The allocution ended with the comforting information that his "very dear son," Napoleon III., had declared that he would maintain the independence of the Papal States.³

The Peace of Villafranca was a great disappointment for the Italian patriots. They had hoped to see the whole peninsula, "from the Alps to the Adriatic Sea," liberated; now they had to content themselves with the surrender of Lombardy to Sardinia (except the fortified places, Mantua and Peschiera), while the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena were to return to their own countries. Indignant over the untimely cessation of hostilities, Cavour resigned his portfolio and went into voluntary exile in Switzerland, there to regain in solitude his balance of mind. La Marmora and Rattazzi then became the leading members

¹ His instructions in Bianchi VIII, 106f., 110f.

² Gregorovius, 76. M. d'Azeglio, 107.

³ Gregorovius, 77.

of the Cabinet. But before Cavour left Italy he had encouraged Massimo d'Azeglio and Farini, who had assumed power at Modena, to hold out and show Europe what the Italians could do for themselves.¹ Farini solemnly declared that Italy had not countersigned the Peace of Villafranca, and he fused Modena, Parma, and Bologna into one state, Emilia, of which he himself proposed to retain the governorship until he could place it in the hands of Victor Emmanuel.

The two emperors at Villafranca had discussed the sins of the papal government. In the first draft of the peace, which Prince Napoleon handed to the Emperor Francis Joseph, Napoleon III. proposed that they should together appeal to the Holy Father to introduce the necessary reforms into his territories, and to separate the Legations for administrative purposes from the rest of the Papal States.² The last part of the appeal was omitted in the final draft,³ but three days after the conclusion of peace Napoleon III. sent Pius IX. a letter, in which, "as a devoted son of the Church," he asked him to grant the Legations a special government by a layman, appointed by the Pope himself, but having at his side a council elected by the people.⁴ In the speech from the throne, which Napoleon delivered to the Chambers after his return from the war, he mentioned as a fact that an Italian federation had been established, with the Pope as chief, and the King of Sardinia as his vicar, and the witty Parisians made fun of the new "Savoyard Vicar."⁵ This federation programme was also laid before the Congress of Zurich by the French Emperor, and in a letter which he sent to Victor Emmanuel, on 20th October, he explained the essential features of his plan for the regeneration of Italy. Italy was to consist of several independent States, joined together in a federal union. The ruling centre of the confederation was to be at Rome, and should consist of representatives of the particular States chosen by the sovereigns on the proposal of their Chambers. "By granting the Holy Father the place of honour as the president of the federation," wrote Napoleon III., "the religious feelings of Catholic Europe will be satisfied; the moral powers of the Pope

¹ Bianchi VIII, 161f. Massari: *Cavour*, 338f.

² Bianchi VIII, 148.

³ *Ibid.*, 154.

⁴ M. d'Azeglio, 113. The letter is of 14th July.

⁵ De Falloux II, 302f

will be augmented throughout Italy; and this will allow him to make concessions to the legitimate wishes of his subjects.”¹

It was the programme of the New Guelphs that Napoleon wished to carry out; but the time for it had long since passed away, and both Balbo and Gioberti would have protested against the way in which the French Emperor proposed to carry their ideas into effect. Napoleon had overlooked the fact that they both expressly gave warning against taking a foreign power (Austria) into the Italian federation, and an Italy without Venice was in their opinion an impossibility.² The Italian patriots were therefore naturally antagonists of the imperial scheme of federation; how was it possible ever to form a confederation with a power which, like the Pope, would at every moment oppose its *non possumus*? Pius IX. was also, of course, an opponent of this phantom of the New Guelph party, and he smiled at their wishing to make him like the ball on the dome of St Peter—to place him high up, but so high that he was lost in the clouds³ The Emperor’s project met with a decided refusal at Rome, and he complained that Pius IX. was not at all *raisonnable*.⁴ Antonelli on this point was as stubborn as his master. He did not at all understand how to turn circumstances to his own account, but only how to offer an obstinate resistance. Thereby, as Minghetti says, he ruined the whole of the Pope’s temporal dominion without saving his honour.⁵ To the politicians of the Vatican any proposal for an alteration of affairs in the States of the Church was merely a subversal of every thing divine and human.

Amongst the French Catholics, too, the Italian policy of France created the greatest indignation. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, expressed, both in a pastoral letter and in an address to Pius IX., his sorrow and pain at the revolution in Romagna,⁶ and Dupanloup, Bishop of Orléans, another of the leaders of the French *ecclesia militans*, in a *Protestation* against the events in Italy, uttered “a cry that made France tremble.” Dupanloup foresaw that the continuation of the revolutionary policy would lead to this, that the Pope would only retain

¹ Sorin, 231f.

² M. d’Azeglio, 108.

⁴ De Falloux II, 307.

⁶ Baunard: *Cardinal Pie* II, 13f., 43.

³ Sorin, 233.

⁵ Minghetti I, 381.

Rome and the gardens of the Vatican.¹ The answer of the government to the opposition of the bishops to the imperial policy was to forbid the publication of pastoral letters in the papers. Montalembert, who had made his voice heard once more, came into fresh conflict with the penal code, and the Catholic organ *le Correspondant* received a warning.

But the French Catholics were not to be frightened, and they soon had fresh occasion to take still greater offence. On 23rd December 1859, a new anonymous pamphlet was published in France and Italy, called *le Pape et le congrès*; everyone knew that this, like *Napoléon III. et l'Italie*, was written by the Emperor Napoleon's intimate friend, La Guéronnière. In this, the question was asked, whether the Pope needed temporal power in order to exercise his spiritual authority. The author's answer to this is a decisive yes; for, as regards religion, it is necessary that the Pope should be a sovereign; as regards politics, it is of importance that the head of 200,000,000 of Catholics should be free, so that he may be neither a Frenchman, nor an Austrian, nor a Spaniard, nor an Italian. But what power must the Pope have? "How can the Catholic authority, which rests on dogma, be united with the political authority, which rests on the needs of society? How can the Pope be Pope and King at the same time? How can the Head of the Church, who excommunicates heretics, be also the Head in a State that protects the liberty of conscience?" No constitution in the world is suited for Rome. The authority of the Pope is incompatible with a State of any magnitude. St Peter's successor ought not to play any high political part, but Europe may well allow that there should be a small sacred spot from which the passions and interests which rend other nations are banished. Such a spot, consecrated by history, is Rome. There can be no possible idea of giving Romagna back to Rome; in order to keep that district under restraint the Papacy would have to be converted into a dictatorship. If, on the other hand, a congress were held, it would be able to put Italian affairs in order, and as the basis for that order the following scheme was put forward: "The

¹ Lagrange: *Dupanloup* II, 206f.

city of Rome is the only possession of importance, the rest is of lesser consequence. The city of Rome and the patrimony of St Peter must be secured to the Pope by the great powers, and also a considerable revenue, which must be paid by the Catholic countries as a tribute of reverence and a means of protection to the Head of the Church." The Emperor Napoleon I., in the author's opinion, had reconciled the faith with the new order of society; if the Emperor Napoleon III. could carry through the programme now proposed, he would reconcile the Pope with the people and the age.¹

La Guéronnière's pamphlet came as a semi-official answer to a letter of 2nd December 1859, in which Pius IX. had informed Napoleon that he would not send any representative to a proposed European congress, unless a guarantee were given him beforehand that the boundaries of the Papal States, as fixed by the treaties of 1815, would be maintained.² On the last day of the year, the Emperor sent the Pope an autograph letter, in which he assured him that it was not lack of devotion to the Papal See, but the inexorable logic of events, which had made him join the Italians in their rising against Austria. As affairs had developed, he perceived no other way but for Pius IX. to sacrifice the disturbed provinces, which had caused the Roman government so many difficulties in the last fifty years; but to do it in such a way that Victor Emmanuel should become the Vicar of St Peter's successor in Romagna. Pius IX. would thus obtain peace for Italy for many years to come, and would secure to himself the remainder of the Papal States.³

Before this letter reached Rome, Pius IX., at the New Year's levée, in a speech to General Goyon and the other officers of the army of occupation, had called La Guéronnière's pamphlet "a strange eruption of hypocrisy," and had expressed the hope that the Emperor himself would condemn the ideas set forth in it. The letter of Napoleon III. showed him that this hope would not be fulfilled; but the Emperor's suggestion must be energetically repelled. So on 8th January he wrote to Napoleon III. that insuperable obstacles hindered

¹ *Le Pape et le congrès* (Paris 1859), 6f., 9, 10, 20, 42, 46.

² Bianchi VIII, 387.

³ The letter in the *Augsburg. Allgemeine Zeitung* for 13th January 1860.

him from following the advice given; he could not give up what did not belong to him personally, but to all Catholics, and he was convinced that the victory of the revolution in Romagna would only be an incentive to the native and foreign revolutionaries in the other provinces to follow in the footsteps of the Romagnuoli. His oath as Pope, forbade him absolutely to give up the Legations, and he took the liberty of reminding Napoleon III. that in the course of the last seventy years there had been frequent revolutions in France, but that the great French nation would scarcely for that reason be willing to agree to a proposal to contract the boundaries of France. Finally, he referred the Emperor to certain secret admonitions which Napoleon I. had left behind, and which were worthy of a philosopher; and he begged the Emperor to remember that they would both soon be set before the judgment seat of God to give an account of their deeds.¹

About ten days later a public rejection of the plans of the Emperor and La Guéronnière appeared in an encyclical, in which Pius IX. expressed his indignation at the plot which Piedmont and France had agreed to lay against the property of the Church.² The tone of this encyclical was very hostile; but as soon after as 3rd February, Antonelli said to the Duke of Gramont, the Ambassador of France at the Vatican, that the papal government felt a lively regret for what had happened in the last few days, for the Pope's allocution on New Year's Day, for the publication of the Emperor's letter, and for the last encyclical which *fort maladroitement* had been sent to Paris even before it was printed at Rome.³ "The Pope," said Antonelli, "wishes sincerely to return to the old relations with the Emperor, and he will eagerly seize the first opportunity that offers itself of assuring him of his friendly feelings." But a week later, the Pope himself said to the Duke of Gramont that he now knew that he

¹ The letter is in the appendix to the *Augsburg. Allgemeine Zeitung* for 7th February 1860.

² *Augsburg. Allgemeine Zeitung* for 31st January and 2nd February 1860.

³ The Duke of Gramont's letter of 4th February 1860 in Thouvenel: *Le secret de l'Empereur* (Paris 1889) I, 21f. This work contains an exceedingly interesting correspondence between Thouvenel and the Duke of Gramont and Count de Flahault, 1860-63.

could expect nothing from the Emperor,¹ and when the papal nuncio at Paris, who had heard of Antonelli's friendly expressions, made enquiries at Rome what the facts were, the papal Secretary of State retracted his words.

These fluctuations in the relation between Napoleon III. and the Pope were hidden from the great majority of people. It was supposed everywhere that La Guéronnière had written on behalf of the Emperor. His pamphlet therefore attracted great attention in all Catholic countries. In Germany the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* considered it an attack on the Papacy, and the paper was highly interested in tracing the reason of this significant change in the sentiments of Napoleon III. towards the see of St Peter. People might imagine that it was due to another unsuccessful attempt on the part of the Emperor to compel the Pope's co-operation at a coronation; to a hope of procuring a throne in Central Italy for a French prince; to a blazing up anew of the old hatred of Austria; to sympathy with Gallicanism; or to the wish to make the intended congress impossible by frightening the papal legates away from it. The influential and well-informed paper did not venture to make a definite choice between the explanations adduced, but contented itself by insisting that the French Emperor was bound to the Revolution by an invisible tie, so that he was compelled to do its bidding whether he would or not.

A similar view found expression in the French *ecclesia militans*. When Dupanloup read La Guéronnière's work, he exclaimed: "This pamphlet comes from hell!" and he immediately began to write a refutation.² Mgr. Pie, borrowing a description from Hilary of Poitiers, spoke of it as *stylo Antichristi compositum*, and on the festival of his great predecessor, 14th January, he caused the archpriest of Poitiers to read from the pulpit in the cathedral "a condemnation of the errors contained in various writings, and especially in the pamphlet *Le Pape et le congrès*."³ Louis Veuillot wrote in the *Univers* that France was the "sword" of the Holy See, and that the French therefore would never suffer the temporal

¹ Letter of 11th February 1860. Thouvenel I, 33.

² Lagrange: *Dupanloup* II, 213f.

³ Baunard: *Cardinal Pie*, 45f.

privileges of the Pope to be trampled upon or abridged. As soon as La Guéronnière's pamphlet was published, the papal nuncio at Paris sought an audience at the Tuileries in order to make representations to the Emperor; but Napoleon III. replied that he was unable to see that the spiritual independence of the Holy Father stood in any relation to the size of the district over which he ruled.¹ But he gave also the promise that he would not allow Sardinia to make further annexations. The French Catholics, however, were by no means satisfied with this, and the indignation at the so-called "sacrilegious policy of France" became at last so outspoken, that the government determined to interfere. The *Univers* was suppressed, the prefects were ordered to look after the words and actions of the bishops and clergy, and a circular from the Minister of Public Worship reminded the episcopate that it owed to the government obedience and respect. But the waves were not stilled. "Liberty is in danger" was the cry from many episcopal palaces, and from many pulpits. Even Lacordaire, who not long ago had been enthusiastic for the idea of a free Christian Italian confederation,² now came forward in defence of Rome with the treatise *De la Liberté de l'Église et de l'Italie*; and men like Villemain and Sylvestre de Sacy rushed into print for the maintenance of the threatened temporal power of the Pope, Villemain in a pamphlet, and De Sacy in an article in the *Journal des Débats*.

In England also the Italian question had stirred people's minds. Many in that country, in the interests of Protestantism and of liberty, sympathised with the policy of Cavour. Gladstone had translated Farini's *Lo Stato Romano*, and Lord John Russell, who had taken over the Foreign Office in 1859, was willing to recognise at once the annexation of Romagna.³ But the Roman Catholic section of the population of Great Britain stood up for the Papacy. The ardent convert, Henry Edward Manning, delivered in the church of St Mary of the Angels in Bayswater a course of sermons, in which he maintained that the temporal power was necessary both for the liberty of the Church and for the spiritual independence of the Papacy, and

¹ Bianchi VIII, 388f.

² See his letter of 12th April 1859. Foisset: *Lacordaire* II, 406.

³ Thouvenel I, 18.

he expressed his firm conviction that the necessity of the Pope's temporal power would in time become a dogma of the faith.¹ His apocalyptic imagination, which had been inflamed by certain strong assertions of Suarez,² led him to utter a prophecy that Rome would once again become a heathen city—indeed the seat of Antichrist. Towards such a prophet Rome had to take up an attitude of reserve. There were Irish Catholics, who, "out of jealousy," accused Manning at the Vatican, and in the *palazzo* of the Propaganda it was considered somewhat "inopportune" at that time to talk of the possibility that St Peter's city might lose its faith. But Manning's bold fight for the Pope as *totius Christianitatis caput et compendium*³ made a great impression upon Pius IX., and by this means the former Anglican archdeacon made his way to the Roman Archbishopric of Westminster.

In spite of the fury of the Roman bishops, priests, and journalists, against those who would only grant to St Peter's successor "Rome and a garden," the Italian movement for freedom continued its course. On 4th January Thouvenel succeeded Count Walewski as French Foreign Minister, and thus vanished Austria's hope of the reinstatement of the Duchess of Parma, and of the Dukes of Modena and Tuscany. A fortnight later, Cavour became Sardinian minister once more, and from that moment fresh life was infused into the Sardinian policy. But Cavour was more than ever in favour of a peaceful understanding with the Pope, and he had scarcely taken over the ministry, before he and the new French Foreign Minister made an attempt in that direction.

The moment was not favourable; the Roman politicians were beside themselves with indignation at La Guéronnière's book. As soon as Cardinal Antonelli read it, he informed the French ambassador that the Holy Father after *un fatto di tanta enormezza* would never take part in a congress,⁴ and in the Vatican they meditated revenge upon rebellious Romagna. The centre of gravity of this policy of revenge, however, was not at Rome but at Naples. At the end of 1859, and the beginning of 1860, widespread intrigues were devised in the

¹ Purcell: *Cardinal Manning* II, 152f.

² *Ibid.*, 156f.

³ *Ibid.*, 163.

⁴ Bianchi VIII, 389.

castle of the Neapolitan king, intended to promote at once the interests of the Courts of Vienna, the Vatican, and Naples. Two ladies, the Archduchess Sophia, and the mother of Francis II., who, like the archduchess, was an Austrian both by birth and by disposition, played a chief part in these machinations, into which the Spanish ambassador and Queen Isabella were likewise initiated.¹ Some despatches were found after the flight of the Bourbons from Naples, from which it is evident that Austria at that time attempted to induce Pius IX. to address an appeal to all Catholics; and at Vienna a proposal was made for the formation of a Catholic league as the only salvation for the see of St Peter. These despatches prove also that Pius IX., on 9th October 1859, had already given the Neapolitan army permission to march through papal territory; but the Holy Father had stipulated that this permission should remain "a profound secret."

While Antonelli was occupied with this policy of conspiracy, a fresh proposal came from France that the Legations should be made a hereditary vicegerency of the house of Savoy, on condition that Europe should guarantee to St Peter's see the remaining portion of the Papal States.² Pius IX. answered, as before, that this solution was unacceptable because the Legations were a part of St Peter's patrimony, which was intended to secure for the Vicar of Christ the necessary means of executing his apostolic office,³ and the Duke of Gramont in vain endeavoured to induce Antonelli to recede in any measure from this position.⁴

Cavour hoped to attain more by employing one of the Church's own men to deal with the Vatican. Victor Emmanuel's almoner, the Abate Stellardi, a learned and respected priest, was sent to Rome with a letter, dated 7th February 1860, in which the Sardinian king assured the Pope that he had the best will to reconcile his duties as a Catholic prince with the duties incumbent upon him as ruler over a free people. He had, so he wrote, taken up his father's work, the work which

¹ Bianchi : *Cavour*, 88f.

² Bianchi VIII, 390f.

³ Despatch from Antonelli to the nuncio at Paris of 29th February 1860. Bianchi VIII, 396.

⁴ Cp. the conversation between the two in Gramont's despatch of 3rd March 1860. Bianchi VIII, 391f.

Rome had at one time blessed, and had striven to free the fatherland from foreign dominion. It was without instigation from his side that the Legations had sought union with Sardinia; but he could not help reminding the Pope that the Holy See had for many years been powerful and revered without these provinces, and he warned the Pope against placing himself in the way of the awakening sense of nationality. On the other hand, the Papacy might, with the help of Sardinia, obtain a place of honour at the head of the whole Italian nation.¹ If Pius IX. should receive this letter kindly, the Abate Stellardi was to open negotiations with Antonelli on the basis that Victor Emmanuel should govern Romagna, Umbria, and the Marches as papal delegate or vicar according to the laws now in force in the other provinces of Central Italy.²

Pius IX. read the King's letter with good will, but the comments which he made upon it ended in a decided rejection, and on 15th February he wrote to Victor Emmanuel that such a proposal was neither befitting a Catholic king nor a prince of the house of Savoy. "My answer," wrote Pius IX., "has been already given in print, in the form of an encyclical to the Catholic episcopate, which your Majesty can easily obtain to read."³

Cavour, however, would not despair as yet. He appealed to Count Sclopis, a layman, who was much respected at Rome on account of his devotion to the see of St Peter, to act as mediator. The Count at first declined, because the matter seemed to him hopeless; but when Cavour pressed him he gave in, but on the condition that Pius IX. should first declare himself willing to discuss. Such a declaration it was impossible to obtain; on the contrary, Antonelli in notes addressed to various powers made acrimonious attacks upon the Piedmontese government; and Pius IX. exhorted the bishops in all countries to pray God to bring the King of Sardinia to repent of all the misfortunes and offences which he was causing to unhappy Italy.⁴

On 11th March 1860 the population of Parma, Modena,

¹ Bianchi VIII, 397f. Massari: *Vittorio Emanuele II*, 319f.

² Cp. the instructions in Bianchi VIII, 399.

³ Bianchi VIII, 402. Massari: *Vittorio Emanuele II*, 321.

⁴ Bianchi VIII, 403.

Tuscany, and Romagna had, with great rejoicings, voted for union with Sardinia, and on 24th March the treaty concerning the cession of Savoy and Nice to France was signed at Turin, after a plébiscite had been taken. France thus became the accomplice of Sardinia,¹ and the French government, as the Duke of Gramont had long feared, made "common cause with the robber." Pius IX.'s anxiety and indignation were great, and on 26th March he caused to be posted at the usual places at Rome an apostolic letter, which pronounced the greater excommunication against those who had appropriated and seized some of the provinces of the Church, and against their helpers, counsellors, and adherents.² Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel were not indeed mentioned in the letter, but nobody could be in doubt as to the persons aimed at. When the French Catholics wished to publish it, an official article in the *Moniteur* reminded them that leave to do so must be obtained from the government in accordance with one of the Organic Articles.³ Without heeding this warning Mgr. Pie on Easter Day 1860, in his full canonicals, with cross and mitre, ascended the pulpit in his cathedral to read the letter of Pius IX., and then preached a sermon full of passionate invective.⁴ At the same time he and other French bishops inflamed the Catholic youth to hasten to the succour of the Pope. A fight for Rome was in the eyes of Mgr. Pie something more than a crusade; he wrote in a pastoral letter: "Jerusalem is our history, but Rome is our life."⁵

The first Italian Parliament, which assembled at Turin on 2nd April 1860, was opened with a speech from the throne, in which Victor Emmanuel expressed his firm determination to protect civil liberty and his royal authority, in case the ecclesiastical powers should defend secular interests with spiritual weapons. He concluded by saying that Italy ought

¹ "Vous voilà devenus nos complices, les complices même de nos folies," said Cavour to one of the French negotiators when the treaty had been signed. Massari: *Cavour*, 364.

² Printed in *Lettres apostoliques de Pie IX.*, 62f. Cp. Gregorovius, 104. A letter from Victor Emmanuel of 20th March and the Pope's answer of 2nd April are to be found in Massari: *Vittorio Emanuele II*, 322f.

³ See Vol. I, 251.

⁴ Baunard: *Cardinal Pie II*, 72f.

⁵ Baunard II, 77.

no longer to be an open field for the ambition of foreigners; the watchword must be "Italy for the Italians."¹

Shortly afterwards Napoleon III. reopened the apparently fruitless negotiations with Rome, but the proposals he now advanced, though supported from Vienna, Madrid, Lisbon, and Naples, did not receive any kindlier reception than the former ones.² Pius IX. would only agree to an arrangement, provided it contained a promise that Romagna should be given back to the Pope. At Rome people dreamed of a crusade which should expel all enemies from the hereditary lands of St Peter, and Pius IX. hoped, as he wrote to the Archbishop of Naples, that God would exterminate the new Sennacheribs. In his distress he appealed to the French general, Lamoricière, Cavaignac's Minister of War, to take the supreme command of the papal troops, of which the nucleus was a battalion of French and Belgian volunteers. Lamoricière acceded immediately to the Pope's request, but the old republican did not everywhere receive a friendly reception at Rome. Antonelli and his clique were "like ice" towards the brave soldier, who had stipulated for free admission to the Pope at any time, and complete independence of all the violet Monsignori and purple Eminences.³ And the Romans grumbled at all the money that was used to put the papal army on something like a warlike footing. Torlonia, they said, did not succeed in draining the Lago di Fucino, but Lamoricière would certainly succeed in emptying the papal exchequer. The new *generalissimo*, however, found support in a powerful war party at Rome, which desired that the papal army should be increased to a strength of 20,000 or 30,000 men, so that there might be some hope of regaining Romagna.⁴

Everything pointed to the conclusion that Rome would have need to use her troops. A month after the assembling of the Italian Parliament, Garibaldi landed with 1,400 Alpine riflemen at Marsala, and from thence began his victorious march through Sicily and Naples. It was not the intention of the bold captain of irregular troops to stop at the borders

¹ Massari: *Vittorio Emanuele II*, 333f.

² Bianchi VIII, 405f. The proposal in a despatch of 8th April 1860.

³ De Falloux II, 319f.

⁴ Letter of the Duke of Gramont, 24th April 1860. Thouvenel I, 135.

of the Papal States; he meant also to annihilate the temporal power of the Papacy. *Roma o morte!* was the watchword which he had inherited from Mazzini. In Umbria and the Marches the ferment grew, and soon Pesaro, Sinigaglia, Urbino, and several other towns in those provinces rose against the papal rule.

It was natural that Rome, under such circumstances, should hurry on military preparations with might and main; but the organisation of the papal army gave Cavour a welcome pretext for opening hostilities against the Papal States. The Piedmontese Cabinet first asked the Pope to disarm its military corps, "the existence of which was a constant menace to the tranquillity of Italy"; and as Rome refused to accede to the request, Piedmontese soldiers marched into the papal territories. This step almost everywhere in Europe caused both aversion and indignation. Napoleon III. telegraphed immediately, on 9th September, to Victor Emmanuel, that the invasion of the Papal States by Sardinia would be a breach of all conventions, and that France, if the rumour were true, would be obliged to oppose such a proceeding.¹ Meanwhile the Emperor ordered the garrison of Rome to be strengthened, and on 30th September Talleyrand, the French ambassador at Turin, was ordered to return home immediately.² The other governments, except England and Sweden, also recalled their representatives, and the Prussian envoy, before his departure, handed to Cavour a severe note containing Prussia's disapproval of the Sardinian policy.³

But Cavour was not to be frightened, and victory accompanied the banners of Sardinia. On 18th September the papal troops were scattered at Castelfidardo by General Cialdini, and Lamoricière had to retire with a small force to Ancona, which was then bombarded by Sardinian war-ships under Admiral Persano. It was now evident to most people that Umbria and the Marches would be lost like Romagna, and all the papal politicians, except Antonelli, lost heart. Little by little, however, both courage and the thirst

¹ "M. Farini m'avait expliqué bien différemment la politique de votre majesté." Thus the despatch runs in Thouvenel I, 196f.

² Thouvenel I, 204.

³ Massari: *Cavour*, 386f.

for revenge revived in the Vatican, and the Papal Minister of War, Mgr. de Mérode, formerly a Belgian officer, and afterwards Archbishop of Mitylene *in partibus*, even dreamt of the possibility of a reconquest of Umbria and the Marches, if it were only possible to put the papal army again on a proper footing.

At Paris there were only smiles for Mgr. de Mérode's child's play in politics and strategy, and the Duke of Gramont was ordered to dissuade Antonelli from entering upon undertakings which might easily lead to a collision between the Piedmontese and French troops.¹ But the exasperation at Rome was great. Pius IX. had formerly ruled over twenty provinces with more than 3,000,000 of inhabitants; now all the ten provinces of the Adriatic portion had fallen away, and of the ten Mediterranean provinces only five were left, with about 685,000 inhabitants.² The districts which Pius IX. had lost were the richest districts, and he needed money very badly. The "Midsummer Night's Dream" of General Lamoricière had cost the Papacy 12,000,000 scudi, and the papal officials in the lost provinces took refuge at Rome in order to find support and maintenance. In the streets and restaurants were to be seen a number of doubtful characters, ragged and fanatical figures. "Slaves of despotism, afraid of the light, seem to have flown hither like owls from all the ruins of the world," wrote Gregorovius in his diary.³

And who was to blame for all these disasters? Most Romans were inclined to lay the chief blame on Napoleon III. Mgr. Talbot, an Irish prelate, who was closely connected with Manning, assured the English agent at Rome, Lord John Russell's nephew, Odo Russell, that he knew from a trustworthy source that the French Emperor had entered into a compact with the devil, and that he often took the advice of the prince of darkness as regards his policy. *Ab uno disce omnes!* added the Duke of Gramont when he reported this "authentic anecdote" to the French Foreign Minister.⁴

In spite of all previous disappointments, Cavour thought that there might be a possibility of peaceful negotiations with

¹ Thouvenel to the Duke of Gramont, 13th October 1860. Thouvenel I, 232f.

² Gregorovius, 138f.

³ *Ibid.*, 155.

⁴ Thouvenel I, 275f.

the Papacy now that it had suffered such great reverses ; and he was still sincerely anxious to find a *modus vivendi* with St Peter's see. He perceived that the proceedings of Sardinia towards Rome had created uneasiness and dislike in many quarters, while there had been but little sympathy for the deposed dynasties of Parma, Modena, and Tuscany. Of a revival of the old proposals about a Sardinian vicegerency there could apparently be no question, but he had a new scheme for giving the Pope ample compensation in the ecclesiastical sphere for all that had been lost in the political.

Cavour revealed the ultimate aim of his policy in a speech, which he made in October 1860, in the Parliament at Turin.¹ The independence of Italy, he then said, has for the last twelve years been Victor Emmanuel's lode-star. From this it follows that the King must wish that the Eternal City, to which twenty-five centuries have given all forms of honour, should become the capital of the kingdom of Italy. Liberty cannot be anything but beneficial to religious sentiment, and the great majority of educated Catholics will acknowledge that the Pope would be able to fulfil his exalted duty far more freely and independently when guarded by the love of 22,000,000 of Italians, than under the protection of 25,000 bayonets. In order to get Rome for its capital, Italy would be able to grant the Church great freedom of action. In the celebrated formula: *libera chiesa, in libero stato* (a free Church in a free State) the Sardinian minister thought that he had found a way of undoing the Gordian knot of Italy. The repeal of the laws of Joseph II., Leopold, and Tanucci, which were so irksome to the Church, was to be the recompense for the surrender of the temporal power of the Papacy.²

Cavour's programme had won adherents even within the ranks of the clergy. An Umbrian priest wrote a little anonymous pamphlet, the main object of which was to induce the country people in Umbria and the Marches to vote for union with Sardinia.³ The author told the Pope that Christ, although

¹ Massari: *Cavour*, 392f.

² See his letter of 4th January 1861 to Count Vimercati, who was intermediary between Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon III. Massari, 409f. Cp. Thouvenel I, 341, 356.

³ *Quattro parole d'un sacerdote ai popoli dell' Umbria e delle Marche*. Cp. Gregorovius, 153f.

of royal birth, would not receive a crown, "not even by a general vote," and he maintained that it was the community of the faithful, and neither the temporal power, nor the Pope, nor the clergy, which constituted the Church. Such voices awakened alarm at Rome, lest something more than the two districts should be lost, and the bishops in Umbria and the Marches thought it best to remind people that the reading of Diodati's translation of the Bible, and of all writings that might lead to heresies, was forbidden.¹ But the Umbrian priest's book and other similar expressions of opinion were in Cavour's eyes a testimony that the soil was prepared to receive the gospel of the free Church in the free State.

At the end of October 1860, therefore, he gave his good friend at Rome, the physician, Diomede Pantaleoni, the task of "sounding" opinions. Pantaleoni entered into communication with Cardinal Santucci, whom he attempted to win over to Cavour's formula by pointing out what happiness a free Church might bring to Italy. Though it was quite clear to Cavour from the beginning that a mere official reopening of negotiations would only mean a fresh refusal on the part of Rome, he hoped to be able to pave the way for a future understanding with the Holy See by bringing a few ecclesiastics, who represented his views, into communication with the Liberal-minded portion of those surrounding the Pope.² He first thought of the General of the Rosminians, Padre Pagani, who had long lived in free England, and who, on account of his position, could travel to and fro between Rome and Turin without creating suspicion. But his final choice fell on Padre Carlo Passaglia, who had been a professor at the *Collegium Romanum* since 1844, and who as such had entered the lists in defence of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. In 1859 Passaglia had left the order of Loyola, and had undertaken a professorial post at the *Sapienza*, the Roman university. This esteemed theologian, of whose orthodoxy only the most fanatical Jesuits entertained any doubt, was in many ways well suited to accomplish the difficult task of reopening the connexion between the Court of Turin and the Vatican; for he was as expert in canon law as in dogmatic theology, and at the same

¹ Gregorovius, 148.

² Bianchi VIII, 411f., 694f. Cp. Thouvenel I, 364.

time no mean politician. Dr Pantaleoni drew up certain propositions, which were to serve as the starting-point for the new secret negotiations with Rome, and Cavour then added to Pantaleoni's draft certain marginal notes, mostly in approval.¹ Napoleon III. was informed that Sardinia was about to reopen dealings with the Vatican, but he was unable fully to approve of the scheme of Dr Pantaleoni and Cavour for an agreement. He had not yet abandoned the idea of the Sardinian vicegerency, and he would have preferred that the Pope's secular government should be converted into a "nominal sovereignty."² The French diplomatists, moreover, had not got beyond thinking of Italian unity as a thing very detrimental to France; and since the temporal power of the Pope was a hindrance to that unity the papal rule must, in their opinion, be kept up at any cost.³

The efforts of Padre Passaglia seemed at first likely to be crowned with success. The Sardinian Consul at Rome, the Baron Teccio, who was also one of the initiated, reported to Cavour in a cypher despatch of 13th January 1861, that Cardinal Santucci, contrary to agreement, had told the Pope everything, but that his indiscretion had done no harm. Pius IX. had acquiesced in the prospect of losing the temporal power, and the same was the case with Antonelli. The Secretary of State had certainly, to begin with, opposed such an expedient, but afterwards he had gone so far as to ask Pius IX. to absolve Santucci and himself from their oath, so that they might discuss the possibility of surrendering the temporal power. They would enter upon the question with Passaglia after the interval of a week, and they wished that an official mediator between Rome and Turin might be appointed, but not a lawyer.⁴

Cavour was exceedingly pleased at this telegram, and sent its contents at once to Paris. Napoleon answered that he also would rejoice at a reconciliation, but that he had

¹ Bianchi VIII, 415f.

² Bianchi VIII, 419, 695f. Cp. Thouvenel I, 393f.

³ The Duke of Gramont wrote to Thouvenel on 29th December 1860 in a sort of review upon the Franco-Italian politics of the last year: "*Je crois que l'Italie une est une chose détestable pour la France. . . . L'existence du pape à Rome comme pouvoir temporel empêche l'unité de l'Italie. Donc il faut l'y soutenir quand bien même nous n'y aurions pas d'autre intérêt.*" Thouvenel I, 336. Cp. 306.

⁴ Bianchi VIII, 420 and 698, with a variation of dates.

only faint hopes of such a happy result.¹ At the end of 1860, he had himself, on the occasion of the appointment to some French bishoprics, received a letter from Pius IX., containing bitter words about the miserable anti-religious agitation of the past year.² In his reply of 25th December 1860, the Emperor said that he had by no means abandoned the two feelings, deeply rooted in his heart, for the independence of Italy, and the maintenance of the temporal authority of the Holy Father—feelings which had caused him to take up arms for Italy two years ago. But what reward had he received? He had been represented as an enemy of the Holy See, and the most hot-headed of the French clergy had been urged to oppose him. Rome had made herself the mouthpiece of a conspiracy against his government, while he himself had acquiesced in a republican of the purest type (Lamoricière) being made chief of the papal army. He had done all in his power without detriment to the interests of France to defend the Pope's authority; but he would not allow his own troops to become an instrument for the oppression of foreign nations. He could not possibly turn his arms against Piedmont, which had been his comrade in the fight for the liberation of Italy, even if there was much in that comrade which he could not do otherwise than blame.³

This letter, of course, did not help to raise the drooping courage of the Pope, and in the beginning of February 1861, La Guéronnière—*l'archi-brochurier*, as the Duke of Gramont spitefully called him⁴—came forward with a new pamphlet, called *La France, Rome et l'Italie*, which was intended to prove that the disinclination of Rome towards reform, and the Austrian sympathies of Pius IX., were the real causes of the unhappy state of Italy. "France," said the author, "will neither sacrifice Italy to the Roman Court nor surrender the Papacy to the Revolution." But this time it was Persigny,⁵ not the Emperor, who had inspired La Guéronnière, and the new pamphlet was intended chiefly to serve as a serious rebuke to the French bishops. Nevertheless, La Guéronnière's new

¹ Bianchi VIII, 421.

² The letter is printed in Thouvenel I, 368f.

³ *Ibid.*, 373f.

⁴ *Ibid.* II, 409.

⁵ See Thouvenel's letter to Gramont. Thouvenel I, 432f.

pamphlet made a painful impression at Rome. Antonelli caused the official *Giornale di Roma* to declare that the accusations of the author against the Papacy had long ago been refuted in the papal encyclicals, and on 24th February Pius IX. at last answered Napoleon's letter.¹ He told the Emperor that the Piedmontese army in the Marches and Umbria did not conceal the fact that the invasion had taken place with the consent of the Emperor. This attack on the Papal States was, in the Pope's opinion, contrary to all international law and all justice, and the plébiscite that had been taken was a tissue of deceit and fraud. Since the Emperor, in a recent speech, had condemned every violation of international law and justice, Pius IX. hoped that he would denounce the Piedmontese seizure of the Marches and Umbria.

For a whole year past Pius IX. had thought of flight. At the beginning of 1860 Antonelli had weighed the possibility that St Peter's successor might again seek refuge at Gaëta, but he had abandoned that plan. "If we go away," he said to Pius IX., "they will take Rome from us, as they took Romagna. We will not do our enemies the pleasure of taking flight."² At the end of 1860 the question of flight was revived. There was then no possibility of fleeing to Gaëta, for Francis II. had shut himself up there with his few faithful followers, prepared for a bombardment, and on 20th November the Dowager Queen of Naples had fled to Rome with her family to ask for an asylum.³ But Cardinal Reisach had come from Germany with an invitation to the Pope to take up his abode in that country; Bamberg, with the old bishop's palace, and the grave of the German Pope, might perhaps be considered a worthy German Avignon.⁴ The Duke of Gramont, however, as he expressed it, kept the Pope in his *soutane*. It was contrary to the interests of France that Pius IX. should leave Italy.

But now the soil of Rome began to burn under Antonelli's feet. There were several cardinals who considered that it would be best to come to terms with Piedmont, and Antonelli foresaw the possibility that the representations of these friends

¹ Thouvenel I, 446f.

² *Augsburg. Allgemeine Zeitung*, 14th January 1860.

³ Gregorovius, 143.

⁴ Thouvenel I, 299.

of peace would in the end make an impression upon Pius IX.¹ In March 1861 Prince Napoleon made a speech in the French Senate, in which he demanded that Rome should be the seat of the Italian government, so that the Pope should have the Leonine district of the city and no more. It was the old idea of St Bridget that St Peter's successor should be content with "the plain surrounded by a strong wall," between the Vatican, St Peter's, the castle of S. Angelo, and S. Spirito, so that he "might more freely and quietly summon his counsellors to him in this smaller space."² At the end of 1860, the advocate Gennarelli had reminded people of St Bridget's prophecy, and proposed that the Pope should live in the Leonine quarter of the town, surrounded by well-paid cardinals, and defended by a guard of honour of 300 men from all the Catholic nations. Thus the gate by the bridge of S. Angelo would be the boundary of his realm, and Gennarelli thought that now and then he would open it for an emperor or a king, who came to receive his blessing and to be his guest.³ A senator who was in close connexion with Napoleon III. had given utterance in the French Senate to the dislike of Liberal Frenchmen towards the see of St Peter. He had called Rome the Coblenz of Catholics and Legitimists, and directed attention to the circumstance that all enemies of France found an asylum there. He concluded his speech by demanding the abolition of the temporal power of the Papacy. The Duke of Gramont, however, who would not give up Rome to Italy, insisted firmly that the Pope must have St Peter's city and the immediately surrounding country,⁴ but that if, as he expected, Pius IX. would not voluntarily agree to this arrangement, France ought to compel both Italy and Rome to sanction it. "France," he wrote to Thouvenel, "must have a free pope; a contented pope is not necessary."⁵

It was with such threats and schemes as these in the

¹ Bianchi VIII, 437.

² *Revelationes Brigittæ* (Romæ 1628) VI, 74 (II, 144).

³ Gregorovius, 148.

⁴ The delegations of Velletri, Frosinone, Roma and Comarca, Cività Vecchia, Viterbo, and a small part of the delegation of Orvieto. Thouvenel II, 15.

⁵ Thouvenel II, 23f.

background that Cavour reopened negotiations with the Roman Court. In December, 1860, he had sent the advocate Bozino of Vercelli to Rome, to spy out the financial position of the Papacy, and to find out from another direction than Pantaleoni's if there were any inclination towards an agreement. Bozino had entered into communication with the Abate Antonino Isaia, secretary of the Dataria, and closely connected with the Liberal Cardinal d'Andrea. In the last half of January, 1861, Isaia informed Bozino, that Antonelli was inclined to negotiate with Cavour on the following basis: (1) The Roman Court to recognise and consecrate Victor Emmanuel as King of Italy in Rome; (2) the Pope to retain sovereign rights over the patrimony of St Peter, but this patrimony to be governed by Victor Emmanuel and his successors as the Vicars of the Pope; (3) the government to give the cardinals 10,000 scudi a year; and (4) the Italian cardinals to have seats in the senate; (5) the Pope to receive a suitable civil list; (6) this arrangement to be guaranteed by law. To these points were added also certain secret conditions: (1) The acknowledgment of all agreements and contracts between the Antonelli family and the Roman government; (2) a compensation of 3,000,000 *lire* to Cardinal Antonelli; and (3) plentiful honours for the Cardinal's brothers.¹ It was Antonelli's intimate friend, the Cavaliere Salvatore Aguglia, formerly secretary to Padre Ventura, who was the go-between in these negotiations.² He afterwards declared publicly that the negotiations between Antonelli and Cavour had then advanced so far that only the signatures and the presentation to the College of Cardinals were wanting. According to Aguglia the secret agreements were that the Pope was to retain his sovereignty over the States of the Church, while the King of Sardinia and his successors were for ever to have the vicegerency of the territories belonging to the Holy See. The civil authority over these states was to revert to the Pope, (1) if the King did not pay the annual sum of money agreed upon; (2) if the unity of Italy ceased; or (3) if Italy came under a foreign power. The Pope was to retain his ancient privileges as the head of the Catholic Church and complete independence; he was to be the owner, as formerly, of all the apostolic palaces except the Quirinal,

¹ Bianchi VIII, 433.² Thouvenel II, 7.

which was to be the palace of the King of Italy; he was to have a *Guardia Nobile*, to which the most famous Italian houses should send their sons, and Swiss troops besides; the cardinals were, as before, to be considered Princes of the Church, and the Italian wearers of the cardinal's hat were to be members of the Italian Senate. During a Conclave the King was to leave Rome "out of regard for the Catholic world at large"; but when the election had been made, he was to return. The Holy Father was to bless the King of Italy and to crown him in the Vatican.¹

Cavour had then such good hopes of a happy issue that on 21st February 1861 he wrote to Passaglia: "I expect that before Easter you will send me an olive branch as a symbol of eternal peace between the Church and the State, between the Papacy and the Italians. If that happens, the joy of the Catholic world will be greater than the joy at the entry of our Lord into Jerusalem nineteen centuries ago."² On the same day he sent a Rosminian from Turin to Rome, with mandates for Pantaleoni and Passaglia as official agents,³ and everything seemed very promising.

But the Jesuits then began to move, to hinder the conclusion of peace between the Papacy and Italy. When the Rosminian came to Ancona, directions were awaiting him from the General of his order to travel past Rome to Naples. The feeling had changed in the Vatican, and had become so warlike towards Piedmont, that Antonelli no longer needed to be afraid of the peace party. He therefore induced the General of the Rosminians to get the inopportune messenger from Cavour out of the way, and in order to make Pantaleoni and Passaglia still more anxious he caused it to be whispered to them that the Rosminian had returned to Turin. The Sardinian Consul then telegraphed to Cavour that Passaglia and Cardinal Santucci were almost in despair at the long delay.⁴

In the last week of February Passaglia had collected a

¹ *Soluzione Italiana, vera, santa, utile della questione Romana, esposizione del cavaliere avvocato Salvatore Aguglia* (Napoli 1862). Cp. Bianchi VIII, 435f. and Thouvenel II, 4f. Isaia wrote: *Negoziato tra il Conte di Cavour e il Card. Antonelli concluso per la cessione del potere temporale del Papa* (Torino 1862). Cp. Reusch: *Index* II, 1163.

² Bianchi VIII, 422.

³ *Ibid.*, 440.

⁴ The telegram in Bianchi VIII, 440.

party of fourteen theologians, who used to meet under the presidency of Cardinal Santucci, to discuss the difficult problem whether the temporal power were necessary. He was convinced that the result of the discussion would be favourable to the Sardinian scheme, and that the decision of the conference would have a certain influence upon the attitude both of the Pope and of Cardinal Antonelli towards the question.¹ The Duke of Gramont, however, who was in communication with one of the intimate friends of Passaglia was able to inform his government that the whole discussion in this committee was *tout simplement ridicule*, because the members did not trust each other, and nobody dared to express his real opinion.² Soon the tide had so completely turned at the Vatican that Antonelli could openly show himself hostile to the contemplated agreement. Pantaleoni received orders to leave Rome; and when the doctor penned a remonstrance, which Passaglia boldly asked Antonelli to place before the Pope, the Secretary of State answered, that if Pantaleoni were not out of the Papal States within twenty-four hours the *carabinieri* would conduct him over the border.³

Shortly before Pantaleoni was expelled, Pius IX., under Jesuit influence, had delivered an allocution to the cardinals,⁴ in which he cut himself off altogether from Sardinia, and stigmatised the "hypocrites" who, after having insulted religion, dared to propose that the Pope should make peace with the modern State and enter into covenant with Italy. The Pope who is the moral force of society, said Pius IX., could never acknowledge the robberies committed by these Vandals without doing violence to the very basis of morality. And like an echo of this allocution Antonelli declared: "We will never make a compact with the robbers" (*non patteggeremo mai cogli spogliatori*).

After such utterances, Cavour had no need to conceal his thoughts. When, therefore, at the end of March an interpellation was made to the ministry on the Roman question, he declared openly that Rome ought to be the capital of Italy, and that

¹ Passaglia's letter of 23rd February in Thouvenel II, 6f.

² The Duke of Gramont's letter of 22nd March 1861. Thouvenel II, 12f.

³ Bianchi VIII, 441.

⁴ On 18th March 1861. Bianchi VIII, 441f.

the question of the proper capital could not be determined by climatic, topographical, or strategical reasons, but only by moral ones. "We ought to go to Rome," he said, "but on two conditions; we must go there with the consent of France, and in such a way that the union of that city with the rest of Italy cannot be interpreted by Catholics outside Italy as a sign of the thralldom of the Church. We must therefore go to Rome without depriving the Pope of any of his real independence, and without allowing the civil power to interpose in the spiritual sphere. Only on these conditions can we do it without risking the welfare of Italy."¹

A fortnight later the Sardinian minister sent a letter to Passaglia, in which he thanked him warmly for his work, for which Italy and the Church would certainly be grateful some day. He expressed also the hope that the Pope, who was then ill, would on his recovery return to a more conciliatory attitude.² But for the present there was no prospect of this. Antonelli was expecting an intervention of the Catholic powers, especially Spain and Austria; and, when Passaglia again pressed him, he answered that the existence of the Papal States was an international question, and that Spain was opposed to the suggestion of Piedmont; the Holy See, therefore, would await the course of events.³

Cavour's hope likewise was set on Europe, but on the Liberal-minded part of Europe. He rejoiced to see that there were German theologians, who, like Döllinger in his famous lectures in the Odeon at Munich,⁴ endeavoured to reconcile themselves to the contingency that the Pope might be obliged to surrender the temporal power. The papal nuncio, it is true, had left the lecture hall in a demonstrative manner, and Döllinger was from that moment looked upon as a heretic by the Jesuit clique in Bavaria, who maintained the absolute necessity of the Papal States as a "material" dogma, which ought as soon as possible to be made a formal one.⁵ But the words of the learned theologian of Munich had found an echo in many places, and

¹ Massari: *Cavour*, 413f.

² Bianchi VIII, 445.

³ Letter from Passaglia to Cavour of 7th April 1861. Bianchi VIII, 446.

⁴ Partly printed in Döllinger: *Kirche und Kirchen*, 666f.

⁵ Friedrich: *Geschichte des vatikan. Konzils I*, 281f.

there were steadily increasing numbers in the Catholic world, who, like Cavour's brother, wished that the Pope would imitate Samuel, who, although himself a prophet and set by God as judge over Israel, gave over the exercise of the royal power to the layman, Saul, because it was the will of the people.¹

Antonelli's hopes of intervention on the part of Spain and Austria were soon disappointed. In April 1861 Thouvenel informed the Spanish ambassador at Paris that France intended to settle the Roman question unaided, and that the French government would take good care that the Holy Father was not deserted during a revolution.² Both Spain and Austria, however, made the objection that the Roman question was an international one and concerned all Catholics, and they proposed that the Emperor should take the initiative in summoning a conference of the Catholic powers for securing the interests of Catholics.³ But the French government would not agree to this, and at Paris people began to contemplate a convention between France and Sardinia, which was to bind the last-named country not to attack the remaining portion of the Papal States, while France promised to withdraw her troops from Rome.⁴ Cavour had his doubts with regard to such a proposal, and in particular he considered that Sardinia ought to be guaranteed full freedom of action in case Rome became the hotbed of disorders which might threaten the peace of Italy. He desired meanwhile that France should recall her troops, thereby recognising the kingdom of Italy, and so make the Papal Court more disposed to a reconciliation. But he died without having attained this end. He expired on 6th June 1861, after having received the last sacraments from the monk Fra Giacomo. His last words were: *Frate, libera chiesa in libero stato!*⁵

When the Pope received the news of Cavour's death, he exclaimed: "Let us pray for him; God's mercy is without end." He was then himself much troubled by his old epileptic

¹ Gustav Cavour's letter to Passaglia, 5th April 1861. Bianchi VIII, 704f.

² Bianchi VIII, 449.

³ *Ibid.*, 452.

⁴ Bianchi (*loc. cit.*), and letter from Thouvenel of 21st April 1861 to the Duke of Gramont. Thouvenel II, 69f.

⁵ Massari: *Cavour*, 434.

attacks, and so feeble that a Conclave was already in contemplation. Antonelli expected that Cavour's death would encourage the Italian republicans, and he foresaw great disturbances which, even if through many dangers and difficulties, might lead to that Catholic intervention, which was his last hope.¹ In France also people were prepared for eventful consequences from Cavour's death, and the question of a recognition of the kingdom of Italy now came to the front in French politics. Napoleon III. ordered Thouvenel to prepare a statement which would serve to defend the French recognition in the face of other powers, and when it was ready it was to be read at a council of ministers. But as soon as the Emperor requested Thouvenel to supply the ministerial council with information as to the state of affairs in Italy, the Empress Eugénie, who, as usual, was present at the deliberations of the council, rose and left the room in great agitation; and from that day she always treated Thouvenel very coldly. The Emperor, however, did not allow himself to be deterred by his consort's anger; he merely said to the imperial chamberlain, the Maréchal Vaillant: "Dear Maréchal, do me the favour of accompanying the Empress and attending to her!" On 16th June the kingdom of Italy was finally recognised by France.²

The Duke of Gramont, who had for some time been tired of the situation at Rome, informed Thouvenel that the Vatican had received the news of this recognition *avec un esprit de modération et de justice*, but that Antonelli was still altogether indisposed to fall in with the dismemberment of the Papal States.³ In the view of the Duke of Gramont the recognition was as inevitable as the ebb and flow of the tide.⁴ In the following year both Russia and Prussia followed the lead of France, and King Luis of Portugal married Victor Emmanuel's youngest daughter, Maria Pia—the god-daughter of Pius IX.⁵

Cavour's death was, of course, a great loss to Padre Passaglia; and in August 1861 Cardinal Santucci also died — whom Minghetti calls the best and most energetic ally of Sardinia

¹ Thouvenel II, 132.

² *Ibid.*, 138f.

³ *Ibid.*, 150.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 152.

⁵ Massari: *Vittorio Emanuele II*, 392f.

in the Sacred College.¹ But Passaglia was convinced that the cause of Italy would not be lost, although its best defender had passed away; and in order to win over more of the ecclesiastics to Cavour's programme of the free Church in the free State, he published anonymously at Florence a book entitled *Pro caussa Italica ad episcopos Catholicos*. The preface showed that the author was a Catholic priest who upheld the orthodox doctrine and discipline of the Church to the utmost, and would maintain a difference between priest and layman "as between heaven and earth."⁶ But, on the other hand, he would not acknowledge any material difference between the bishop and the priest; and the priests, in his opinion, had the same right as the bishops to defend religion and to expound the gospel. It was in virtue of this right that he, the priest, spoke out. He was full of sorrow because so many Italians had left the Church. And why? It was not because they had renounced the faith of the Roman Church, or because they despised the papal authority, but because their programme was that of Cavour—a free Church in a free State. This idea, says the author, the bishops must not reject; they must not give offence to souls by persecuting pious Italian Catholics who work for a free Church in a free State. The Italian Church is in danger of falling into ruins when the bishops and the Pope act thus, and the unity of the Church disappears.

The author next examined the motives which had led bishops and priests to take so hostile an attitude towards the popular cause. He thought that the excommunication recently pronounced had rather caused a fresh deadly wound than healed the old one. Inasmuch as many of the ministers of the Roman Church had expressed themselves as opposed to the popular cause, because legitimate thrones had fallen, the author reminded them that the Lord refused to divide the inheritance, and that His Apostles came to the judgment-seat as prisoners, not as judges. The ministers of the Church have authority over consciences, but not over earthly goods. The accusation of injustice which had been preferred against the national Italians is refuted by the author in good Jesuitical style by the aid of Probabilism. Teacher rises up against teacher when the

¹ Bianchi VIII, 711.

question is discussed how far a nation is free to alter its form of government. As regards his own country, he demanded that the Church should fall in with the political unity of Italy, which had been recognised by all temporal powers, and was now a historical fact. The Papacy had acted thus on former occasions, and only in this way could the clergy be one with the people. The Pope ought not to go on with his reproaches against Italy. His oath cannot come into question, for the formula refers only to such cession of papal territory as might be due to family interests or for private gain. It is now the Pope's duty to sacrifice his temporal power, and to rejoice that the Italian Parliament has unanimously affirmed the principle of a free Church in a free State. Neither the majesty nor the freedom of the Pope will suffer by the surrender of the temporal power. The Pope, like the Church, must now prepare himself for a heavy journey through the world; but without temporal power he will be better able to follow Christ. The sceptre must now be separated from the keys, the royal crown from the mitre; for the people of Italy and all civilised nations require that Rome shall be the capital of Italy.

The Roman police quickly discovered who had written this book, which was so unwelcome to Rome. On 9th October 1861 it was put on the Index, and Padre Passaglia's house was searched—amongst other reasons, because they expected to find there a manuscript of the previous century by the Jesuit, Cardinal Toloruci, which was said to contain various revelations of the proceedings of the Jesuits. As Passaglia, after the searching of his house, was placed under police supervision, he preferred to fly, and on 17th October it was reported at Rome that he had safely passed the frontier.¹ After his flight, the houses of many of his friends also were searched, and the Pope in his wrath gave orders to paint out his portrait in the great picture which was to glorify the dogma of the *conceptio immaculata*. Passaglia fled to Turin, where he became professor of moral philosophy, and as such he continued his efforts to bring about a reconciliation between the Church and Italy. In a fresh pamphlet he maintained that it was the duty of the Pope to reside at Rome, even if the city

¹ Gregorovius, 191. Cp. Reusch : *Index* II, 1160.

became the capital of the kingdom of Italy ; but St Peter's successor ought to live there in apostolic simplicity, not in the old splendour, and from 1862 to 1866 he published a journal for politics and religion called *Il Mediatore*.

Cavour's idea found support amongst other Catholic priests besides Passaglia. The highly esteemed Francesco Liverani, domestic prelate to the Pope, and pro-notary, propounded first in a daily paper, and afterwards in the book called *Il Papato, l'Impero e il Regno d'Italia*, similar views to those of Passaglia, and at the same time he laid bare several scandals in the ecclesiastical and temporal government of Rome.¹ The Jesuits immediately opened a violent attack upon Liverani, affecting both his person and his book,² and when the Florentine dignitary answered this strong attack with a new book, *La Curia Romana e i Gesuiti*, he was deprived of his canonry.

In order to defend the temporal power, Father Augustin Theiner, one of the priests of the Oratory, whose post was at the rich source of the papal archives, published a *Codex diplomaticus Domini temporalis S. Sedis*,³ which was intended to explain to ignorant diplomatists and theologians the old well-founded right of the Papacy to the Papal States. Pius IX. had at the same time the satisfaction of learning that Döllinger had made a sort of retractation. The learned church historian had come to be afraid of the deductions that were drawn from his language in the Odeon lectures, and in order to allay the storm and remove various misunderstandings, he published, under the title of *Kirche und Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat*, certain comprehensive reflexions of a historical and political kind. A portion of this work is still considered by the Jesuits as "a splendid apology for the Holy See."⁴ Another portion exposes so completely the inward and outward evils of the Papal States, that the Italian translation of the book provided the adherents of the Italian kingdom with a sharp weapon against Rome. Döllinger's book, as a whole,

¹ Reusch : *Index* II, 1162.

² These articles were afterwards collected in a book with the same title as Liverani's (Roma 1861), see especially the section "Lo Scrittore," if.

³ Three volumes. First vol. Rome 1861. The preface is dated on the octave of the day of St Peter and St Paul.

⁴ E. Michael : *I. von Döllinger* (Innsbruck 1892), 10.

has recently been well characterised as the first and most important testimony to the perplexed condition into which the conflict between the historical conscience and the requirements of ultramontane policy had brought scientific Catholic theology in Germany.¹

¹ *Kirchenpolit. Briefe* XI in the *Beilage zur Allg. Zeitung* for 1st May 1896.

CHAPTER XIX

THE SEPTEMBER CONVENTION AND THE ENCYCLICAL OF 8TH DECEMBER 1864

THE debate in the Italian Chamber upon the interpellation which has been mentioned above¹ ended with the almost unanimous passing of an order of the day, in which the Chamber expressed its conviction that France—with due regard to the Pope's dignity, honour, and independence, and to the perfect freedom of the Church—would adhere to the principle of non-intervention, and that Rome, which had been chosen as capital by the nation, would be united to Italy.²

By accepting this order of the day, the Italian government solemnly recognised the watchword of the Mazzinians, *Roma capitale*, and it was now repeated from one end of the peninsula to the other. Opposition, however, was not wanting. Some weeks before the interpellation³ Massimo d'Azeglio, in the pamphlet called *Questioni urgenti*, had expressed his fear lest the "rage for Rome" should become a snare to Piedmont. Italy ought to have not one, but several capitals, a military, a commercial, an artistic, a scientific, a religious, an industrial capital. It mattered less where the government took up its seat, for the town where the government was would only be one of the many Italian capitals. But it was clear to D'Azeglio that Florence, both on account of the intellectual pre-eminence of the town, its pure language, its position in the middle of the peninsula, its healthy climate, and its secure strategic position, was obviously entitled to

¹ See p. 231f.

² L. Magini: *Roma capitale al primo parlamento Italiano* (Firenze 1895), 190.

³ Cp. M. d'Azeglio: *Correspondance politique*, 181f.

become the seat of government.¹ He condemned the programme, *Roma capitale*, because it was partly an expression of the hatred of the Italians for the Pope's temporal power, partly a concealed attack on the monarchy. It was really the old watchword of the political clubs, which Cavour had borrowed in order to outdo Mazzini and his gang.² The Roman question was really, in the opinion of D'Azeglio, "the great danger." Apart from the religious difficulties involved in making Rome the capital of Italy, it was to be feared that, when the residence of the government had been transferred to that city, Mazzini would triumph over both the monarchy and the Papacy at once. On St Joseph's Day, 1861, festival had been held at Rome, with volleys of musketry in the street, and illuminations in the windows, for the two prophets, Joseph Mazzini and Joseph Garibaldi. What might not then happen, when the city had become the capital of Italy?³

Massimo d'Azeglio was not alone in this opinion. Enrico Cernuschi, who had formerly been enthusiastic for the idea of the incorporation of Rome with the kingdom of Italy, now declared openly that he had learned that there was no room for tribunes, and still less for a king, above the catacombs, between the churches, and beside the Vatican.⁴ But Cavour's successors, Ricasoli, and after him Rattazzi, did not share these scruples, and it was impossible to stop the cry of *Roma capitale*. It was now asserted that it was not only the right of the Italians to go to Rome, but that there was urgent need for them to do so, because that city, if it continued to be politically separated from the rest of Italy, would be a centre for reactionary intrigues and conspiracies.⁵ The more cautious, however, adhered to the view that the Italians ought only to go to Rome with the consent of France; and it was at present impossible to obtain it. Napoleon was obliged to go carefully in his dealings with the Papacy, not only on account of the Empress Eugénie and her ultramontane camarilla, but also because he did not dare to offend the French Catholics. The bishops were again busy

¹ D'Azeglio: *Questioni urgenti* (Firenze 1861), 51f.

² D'Azeglio: *Correspondance politique*, 177f., 241f., 261f., and other places.

³ *Ibid.*, 189.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 198f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 201f.

drawing biblical and historical comparisons of a pointed character, so that Thouvenel had to complain to Rome, and ask Pius IX. to damp the ardour of the ecclesiastical hotspurs, especially of Bishop Pie, who represented the Emperor as a new edition of the persecutors of the Primitive Church.¹ But Rome naturally would not disavow such an energetic champion as the Bishop of Poitiers, and in the French Senate the bold controversialist found both defenders and adherents.

The Roman question became, therefore, more and more burdensome to the French statesmen. "This unhappy question affects both my health and my intellect," wrote Thouvenel on 21st March 1862 to the Duke of Gramont, and he could see no solution of it. France could certainly say to Victor Emmanuel, "If your Majesty does not comply with our wishes, then we remain at Rome;" and to Pius IX., "If the see of St Peter will not be content with this, we will quit Rome." But in case the King should not agree to the French proposals, the occupation, which was in many ways so irksome, must needs be continued, and if the Pope should be refractory, it would be very questionable policy all the same, when it came to the point, to leave him to his fate.²

Napoleon III., however, seemed himself at that time to have hopes. On 20th May 1862, in a letter to Thouvenel, which was afterwards inserted in the *Moniteur*, he wrote that he believed that he should succeed in inaugurating a compact between religion and liberty by supporting the national wishes of the Italians, and by converting the Pope from an opponent into a supporter of these wishes. But Rome must, in that case, be "Italianised," and a *modus vivendi* must be found, by which the Pope should continue to be master in St Peter's city; only he must make lower the barriers which separated his own territories from the rest of Italy.³ In order to find, if possible, a precedent for the adjustment of the difficulties in Rome itself, the Emperor asked for accurate information as to the position of the Lord Mayor and the Corporation of London.⁴

¹ Baunard : *Le Cardinal Pie* II, 167f.

² Thouvenel II, 262f.

³ *Ibid.*, 303. Cp. D'Azeglio ; *Correspondance politique*, 240.

⁴ Lecky : *Democracy and Liberty* (London 1896) I, 413.

Thouvenel could not share the sanguine hopes of his Emperor. The compact of which Napoleon III. dreamt was, and in his opinion continued to be, nothing but *un mariage impossible*. He was convinced that there was not the least prospect of Rome's giving way.

And in this he was not mistaken. On 25th March Pius IX. delivered a speech to the priests of Rome in Sta. Maria sopra Minerva in which he declared that the temporal power was not indeed an article of the faith, but was absolutely necessary for the independence of the Holy See.¹ Shortly afterwards, bishops and priests from all countries began to stream to Rome to assist at a great canonisation. Twenty-three Franciscan missionaries, who had suffered martyrdom in 1594 at Nagasaki, three Jesuit missionaries in Japan, and the Trinitarian, Michael de Sanctis, after a successfully concluded examination of their qualifications were to have the place of honour upon the altars. Everybody expected that Pius IX. would again on that occasion speak on the burning question, and nobody doubted in what direction his words would tend. In an allocution to the cardinals on 23rd December 1861, he had let fall some remarks to the effect that he wished to procure for the Church new advocates (*patroni*) with God, because its liberty, its privileges, and its doctrines were attacked in such a deplorable way.² When on Ascension Day, 1862, he blessed the *urbs et orbis* from the loggia of the Vatican, he had Bishop Dupanloup by his side, and amidst the confluence of bishops which was taking place this indefatigable champion of the temporal power was the lion of the day both at the Vatican and in the streets of Rome.³

On Whitsunday, 8th June, the canonisation took place. Columns were erected in St Peter's for the pictures representing the miracles of the saints-designate, and the enormous pilasters of the church were pasted over with yellow marble paper. "The Pope will soon leave us," said Pasquino; "he is already packing up St Peter's (*già incarta S. Pietro*)."⁴ In spite of the low state of the treasury Pius IX. sacrificed 10,000

¹ Gregorovius: *Röm. Tagebücher*, 201.

² [Cl. Schrader]: *Pius IX.*, 21.

³ Lagrange: *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup* II, 258f.

⁴ Gregorovius, 205f.

scudi to the illumination of St Peter's; 13,000 candles were lighted, of which the tallest were eight feet high. In accordance with the ritual of such occasions a petition was thrice addressed to Pius IX. to grant to the Church the new intercessors. Then followed the proclamation of the new saints, and when it was ended, the Pope intoned the *Te Deum*, whereupon the 50,000 men and women who were present took it up; the guns boomed from St Angelo, and the bells of the 300 churches of Rome rang out. Pius IX. delivered a speech at the canonisation which ended with a prayer from which the following is an extract: "Almighty and merciful God. . . . Turn not Thy mercy away from us for the sake of these saints, and let Thy church by their merits (*per eorum merita fac*), having triumphed over all errors, and overcome all difficulties, day by day flourish more mightily, and let it rule from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof." The whole solemnity lasted five hours.

On Whit Monday Pius IX. gathered the cardinals and bishops to a secret consistory, and delivered a speech in which he poured out the vials of his wrath upon the leaders of the Italian revolution, who said that they wished the Church to be free, but who daily, with sacrilegious audacity, robbed the Church of its goods, and persecuted its ministers; and he expressed his special regret that neither the Italian nor the Portuguese bishops, on account of the prohibition of their respective governments, could be present at this great festival. But concerning the impious conspiracy which desired utterly to destroy the temporal power of the Apostolic See, he preferred to remain silent.¹ The 300 foreign bishops who were on the spot then presented an address in which they declared that the temporal power was a necessity for the successor of St Peter. The address had had a little previous history, which showed that worldly politics could make their influence felt even at such a solemn moment. Both Wiseman and Dupanloup had made drafts of an address, but the English archbishop's draft was, in the opinion of the French, "not sufficiently friendly towards France." The matter was therefore referred to a committee, which fused

¹ The allocution of 9th June 1862 is printed in [Cl. Schrader] *Der Papst und die moderne Ideen* (Vienna 1864), 1f.

the two addresses into one. The biographer of the Bishop of Orléans remarks, however, with evident satisfaction, that the sentence about the Pope's temporal sovereignty—that is to say, the chief point of the address—was taken from the proposal of the French bishop.¹ “The Bishop of Orléans has won his spurs,” Napoleon III. remarked, when he heard of Dupanloup's “patriotic” behaviour at Rome; and after his return the Bishop of Orléans received a semi-official expression of thanks from the French Minister of Public Worship.

Whilst the diplomatists were wearying themselves with pondering over the Roman question, and Pius IX. was multiplying the heavenly host which was to defend the patrimony of St Peter, Garibaldi and his friends were taking evil counsel against Rome. Victor Emmanuel had in vain tried to turn the thoughts of the bold *condottiere* towards Venice; he was determined to go to Rome. *Roma o morte! Roma capitale!* The Russian and Prussian recognition of the Italian kingdom, which arrived in the middle of July, gave fresh impetus to the desires of the Italians, and in the city of St Peter, at the end of July, people feared that a new adventurous attack on the part of the Garibaldians was imminent.²

In order to warn these latter, Victor Emmanuel, in an appeal to the Italian nation, dissociated himself altogether from the policy of the free corps. He even made use of the harsh statement that every appeal which did not originate from himself was an appeal to revolt and civil war; and he added that those who did not obey his admonition would be held responsible. In spite of this warning Garibaldi with 3,000 men made an unsuccessful expedition against Catania, and when his corps had dwindled down to 2,000 men, he crossed to Calabria and turned towards Reggio. But General Cialdini marched against him with an army of Italian troops, and on 27th August Colonel Pallavicini took him prisoner on the hills by Aspromonte. The wounded chief was taken to Spezzia, and from thence back to Caprera. The Italian soldiers

¹ Lagrange II, 262. U. Maynard: *Monseigneur Dupanloup et M. Lagrange son historien* (Paris 1884), 130f. Cp. Gregorovius, 206.

² Gregorovius, 209.

and Pallavicini treated him with the greatest respect, and some of the most zealous adherents of the Papacy grieved over his defeat. The papal nuncio at Paris, Mgr. Chigi, had even offered prayers for Garibaldi's enterprise in the hope that the victory of the revolution in Italy might be a good means of getting order restored, because it would probably cause France and Austria to intervene conjointly.¹

During all this time the solution of the Roman question was drawing nearer. On 31st May 1862 Thouvenel sent to the French ambassador at Rome, the Marquis de La Valette, a despatch containing France's recommendations to the Papacy. These were the following. (1) The *status quo* was to be maintained, and Italy was to promise to abstain from attacking the remainder of the Papal States, which the Great Powers were to guarantee to the Pope. (2) The kingdom of Italy was to take over either the whole Roman public debt, or the greater part of it. (3) An annual civil list was to compensate the Pope for the income from the lost provinces. (4) Reforms were to be effected at Rome calculated to make the Pope beloved by his subjects.² Cardinal Antonelli, however, scouted all these recommendations with the asseveration that the Holy See could only enter into negotiations which were based on the integrity of the papal possessions.

This refusal did not surprise Thouvenel; but he did not therefore relinquish his projects. If an agreement could not be brought about *with* Rome, the question must be settled without Rome. The Emperor was now tired of "acting gendarme" to the ungrateful Pope, and Thouvenel himself was in constant anxiety lest Napoleon III., by an incautious promise, should bind himself to the one side or the other. He was vexed with the vacillating Emperor, influenced now by clericalism, now by Liberalism. The clerical influence was in his opinion the most dangerous, alike for the Emperor, the dynasty, and the country; and nearly all the ministers agreed with him. Only Count Walewski, the War Minister (Maréchal Randon), and the Minister of Finance (Magne), supported the clericals; but these had "a powerful ally" in the Empress; and the atmosphere at the Court was favourable to them.³

¹ Thouvenel II, 384f.

² *Ibid.*, 408f.

³ *Ibid.*, 380f.

The Duke of Gramont had also a presentiment that the summing up was at hand, and on 15th September 1862 he sent a note from Vienna, containing his suggestions for a solution. He was now certain that the matter must be settled without Rome; for Pius IX. had rejected all offers, and his rejection was not an expression of the view of a single pope—it was the last word of the Papacy. But since France had protected Pius IX. for thirteen years, she could not, both for her own sake and for the sake of the Catholic world, recall her troops without a word; before the French troops left the papal dominions, a guarantee of the inviolability of the papal territory must in one way or another be obtained. The Duke of Gramont thought it possible that in the course of six, or even three, months France might recall her troops, but that first Austria and then, perhaps two years later, Spain, as the third Catholic power, might send the 12,000 to 15,000 men necessary to secure the inviolability of the Pope's temporal power. If Austria or Spain refused to accept this arrangement, then it would not be France but Roman Catholic Europe which would desert St Peter's successor.¹

Thouvenel at an earlier stage had himself thought of a similar arrangement, with alternate Catholic garrisons at Rome;² but if the burden could be divided with none but Austria and Spain, two powers, moreover, which had not yet recognised the Italian Kingdom, he considered it to be too heavy. He thought that it would be best to limit the French occupation of Rome to twelve or fifteen months, and to let Italy know that any incursion upon the borders of the Papacy after that time would be regarded as a *casus belli*. On 25th September he communicated to the *Moniteur* the above-mentioned despatch to the Marquis de La Valette, and this step attracted much attention in the diplomatic world. At Vienna the publication of the despatch just at that moment was considered as a move on the chessboard which was to prepare the world for the recall of the French troops. But opinions as to the consequences of the policy of the French government were much divided. Some were afraid of the recall of the troops, because,

¹ Thouvenel II, 393f.

² Cp. the letter to the Duke of Gramont of 25th September 1862. Thouvenel II, 406.

as Rome might not be touched, the Italians might easily be compelled to turn upon Venice; others rejoiced at it, because the downfall of the Pope would mean a weakening of French influence, and be the beginning of a revolution and an anarchy which would be destructive of the unity of Italy. The Duke of Gramont's own opinion was that the recall of the troops at a period fixed and announced beforehand would be most dangerous, in case the Papacy could not get other troops instead. The revolutionary party would, of course, organise itself, and await the departure of the French; and what would France do if Pius IX. were to appeal to Austria for help? And would France declare war with Austria if such help were granted? He preferred therefore the formation of a papal army which might defend Rome for four or five years. All he cared about was that the blame for the fall of the temporal power should not be thrown on the Emperor, for that might be hazardous to the dynasty.¹

At this juncture England again interfered in the matter. Lord John Russell asked in the interests of the world's peace and of Catholicism that France should permit the Italians to obtain "their legitimate capital," and in a circular issued by General Durando the same demand was advanced.² In Hyde Park, on 5th October 1862, there was a collision between the Irish, who shouted: "Long live the Pope!" and the Garibaldians, who shouted: "Long live Garibaldi!" When Lord Palmerston made the French government responsible for these scenes, Count de Flahault, the French ambassador in London, answered by asking Lord Palmerston to use his influence to prevent Lord John Russell from writing despatches to Paris about the evacuation of Rome; for they had no other effect than to make what was in itself difficult quite impossible.³

On 11th October Thouvenel had advanced so far that he could inform the Duke of Gramont that the government intended to withdraw the French troops from Rome by degrees, but in such a way that the Emperor could neither be accused of

¹ Cp. the letter of the Duke of Gramont of 2nd October 1862. Thouvenel II, 417f.

² Thouvenel II, 423f.

³ Count de Flahault's letter of 9th October 1862 to Lord Palmerston. Thouvenel II, 434f.

treachery nor of impatience.¹ But two days after, Napoleon III. told him that he desired the resignation of the Cabinet, and the formation of a new ministry under the influence of Count Walewski,² and a few days later, Drouyn de Lhuys took over the Foreign Office for the fourth time. The Emperor's ultramontane sympathies had triumphed over his Liberal ones.

But at Rome people were not at ease. When Emile Ollivier, after Drouyn de Lhuys had again moved to the Quai d'Orsay, asked Antonelli if he was not pleased with the change of ministry, the cardinal answered: "No, we only begin to be really frightened when it is our friends who are charged with our execution."³ And his anxiety did not seem unfounded. On 29th January 1863 Thouvenel in the Senate defended his Roman policy, especially the despatch of 31st May 1862 to the Marquis de La Valette, and he expressed on this occasion his conviction that he had chosen the only possible way of solving the Roman question. He said also that he did not cherish the least ill-will against Rome; but that immobility, which was a strength in religion, might easily in politics lead to the loss of crowns.⁴

The Italian government had not given up its attempts to find a *modus vivendi* with Rome. Amongst Pasolini's paper have been found some undated notes which were to have formed the basis of the solution of the Roman question so soon as the foreign occupation had ceased. "If the Roman government," so they run, "arrives at an understanding with its subjects, we will not enter its territory, but if this is not the case, we will make the Pope an offer with regard to securing the free Church in the free State; and with regard to his own maintenance. We will also prevent the occurrence of disorders and recourse to foreign intervention."⁵ This sketch belongs, without doubt, to the short period between December 1862 and March 1863, when Pasolini was the Italian Foreign Secretary in the Farini Ministry, and it probably reflects the attitude of that Cabinet towards the Roman question. The plan of a new Babylonian exile was also revived at that

¹ Thouvenel II, 426f.

² Letter of Thouvenel on 13th October to Count de Flahault. Thouvenel II, 427f.

³ Thouvenel II, 439.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 454.

⁵ Pasolini *Memorie*, 342. Cp. 354.

time, and Odo Russell, in the autumn of 1862, on behalf of England, offered Pius IX. and the cardinals a place of refuge at Malta. Antonelli answered immediately that the Pope relied upon the protection of France, and on 31st January 1863 a formal refusal was given to the English offer.¹

At that point Mazzini re-appeared in public, and it seemed for a moment as if he and Victor Emmanuel might come to an agreement; for when it came to the point, the old conspirator preferred Italy even to the Republic, and Victor Emmanuel was not afraid to join with the enemy of monarchy where the unity of the country was at stake.

In April 1863, Mazzini travelled from London through Germany to Switzerland, while his friends went by Paris.² He soon discovered that it would be very difficult to collect volunteers after Aspromonte, and that he must expect the Italian government to put hindrances in the way of his schemes if he attempted to act independently. Negotiations between the King, Mazzini, and the revolutionary party of action in Rome were accordingly opened, with the engineer Diamilla Müller as intermediary, and these negotiations extended far into the year 1864, but without leading to any result.³ In spite of the best intentions on both sides, there was not sufficient agreement either as to the end or as to the means, and Victor Emmanuel had constantly religious scruples on the subject of his conduct towards the Papacy. The letters from him to Pius IX., which were published not long ago in the *Civiltà Cattolica*,⁴ show that the Italian king, in spite of his Liberal politics and his licentious life, was full of reverence for the Church and the Holy See. While he stretched out one hand to Mazzini, he stretched out the other to Pius IX.⁵ Nor was he the only one who carried on a double policy. *La politica segreta* played an unusually important part throughout the period from 1858 until 1870;

¹ Pasolini, 343. Gregorovius, 228.

² *Politica segreta Italiana* (1863-1870) ed. 2 (Torino 1891), 21f.

³ *Politica segreta Italiana*, 20f. *Roma e Venezia. Ricordi storici d'un Romano* (Roma 1895), 174f.

⁴ *Civiltà Cattolica* for 3rd and 17th August 1889. Cp. *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1889, II, 44of.

⁵ See for instance the letter in the *Civiltà Cattolica* for 17th August, 402, dated 18th September 1859.

Napoleon III., Victor Emmanuel, and all the Sardinian and Italian ministers were guilty to an uncommon degree of political double-dealing and equivocation.¹

At Rome people were not ignorant either of Victor Emmanuel's willingness to join the revolutionary party or of his religious scruples, but they expected to be able to take advantage of both. If the Italian king really entered into a compact with the revolution, the Papacy might hope for help from European Conservatism; if his religious scruples were sufficiently strong, then Ultramontanism might become just as important a power at the Court of Turin as it constantly was at the Tuileries. On New Year's Day, 1863, Pius IX. expressed to the French officers of the Roman army of occupation his warm thanks for the protection of France, and he also compared the Church and himself to the angel with whom Jacob wrestled by night. But in order to show some readiness to promote the reforms which even Drouyn de Lhuys demanded, he determined that the municipal councils hereafter should be constituted by free election.² And courage rose in ecclesiastical circles, because it was thought that manifest judgments of God were to be seen which foreboded victory for the cause of Rome. Did not Cavour die before he had been able to set the finish to his work? Had not Garibaldi, after the unfortunate day at Aspromonte, become a sentimental Romantic, half laughable on account of the fanatical letters which he sent from Caprera? And was it not a judgment of God that the Italian Prime Minister, "the dictator of Emilia," Farini, in March 1863, had to be taken as a madman to the monastery of Novalesa, which he himself had dissolved?³

But in spite of the growing courage, there was not always that concord which might have been wished for within the walls of the Vatican. The Minister of War, Mgr. de Mérode, who was the tool of the Jesuits, could never get on with Antonelli. At the beginning of March 1863, Antonelli in his annoyance actually sent in his resignation; but Pius IX. wept and begged so long, that the Cardinal continued. In May things again went wrong, and Antonelli once more wished

¹ Cp. *Roma e Venezia*, 189f.

² Gregorovius, 226.

³ *Ibid.*, 257f.

to resign. This time also he was brought round. He had, however, to submit to seeing that Mgr. de Mérode obtained more and more influence, while his own duties for a time were limited to diplomatic affairs.¹ He had for many years endeavoured with petty jealousy to keep all marked personalities out of the Sacred College.² He was now punished, because the insignificant cardinals rallied round the arrogant Belgian, and made the College of Cardinals a stronghold of Jesuitism and the reactionaries.

At the close of 1863, proposals for a congress were revived, but again without result, on account of the jealousy between the Great Powers. Pius IX. gave a very diplomatic answer to the imperial invitation to the congress,³ and Antonelli asserted that Rome would in no circumstances send representatives to a congress which began by declaring the treaties of 1815 to be annulled. At the same time, the *Osservatore Romano* maintained that God had made St Peter's successor the judge of sovereigns and nations, and that all misfortunes were the result of not obeying the papal judgments.⁴ It was evident that Thouvenel and the Duke of Gramont were right, when they insisted that the Roman question must be solved without the co-operation of Rome.

On 15th September 1863 the settlement came at last. Drouyn de Lhuys was at the theatre in the evening with Count Walewski,⁵ but during an *entr'acte* he left unobserved, and signed the so-called September Convention, which had been concluded with the greatest secrecy between Drouyn de Lhuys, on behalf of France, and the Cavaliere Nigra and the Marquis Pepoli, on behalf of Italy. It was a realisation of the ideas expressed by Massimo d'Azeglio in his *Questioni urgenti*,⁶ and advocated also by Thouvenel. It consisted of four articles. In the first Italy promised to abstain from attacking the

¹ Gregorovius, 227f, 231, 256.

² H. d'Ideville: *Journal d'un diplomate en Italie*, 209f.

³ Pius IX.'s answer to the invitation will be found in the *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 13th December 1863.

⁴ Gregorovius, 257.

⁵ D'Ideville, 258.

⁶ "Je pourrais bien être le parrain, sinon le père de la *néonata* qu'on appelle la 'Convention,'" M. d'Azeglio wrote to Eugène Rendu. M. d'Azeglio: *Correspondance politique*, 288f.

portion of the Papal States which still remained to Pius IX.,¹ and, if necessary, to prevent others by force from attacking St Peter's patrimony. In the second, France promised to withdraw her troops from the Pope's territory by degrees, as the papal army became organised, and the withdrawal was to be completed in the course of two years. The third article prohibited Italy from objecting to the organisation of a papal army, consisting of volunteers from all countries, on condition that this force did not deteriorate into a means of attacking Italy. Finally, Italy declared herself willing to take over a suitable portion of the papal debt. Together with the Convention a protocol was also signed to the effect that the King of Italy should within six months move his residence from Turin to another Italian town.²

When Drouyn de Lhuys, on 23rd September, despatched the Convention to the French ambassador at Turin, Baron Malaret, he expressed the hope that it would effect a reconciliation between the Papal See and Italy. He hoped that Rome would understand how to value both the motives of France, and the guarantees which were given to the Pope. "Even if Rome," he writes, "does not at first feel inclined to view very favourably the agreement which we have just concluded, with a power separated from it by the recollection of recent troubles, the signature of France will, we do not doubt, at least give the assurance that the convention will be carried into effect with loyalty and consideration."³

These hopes were not fulfilled. The September Convention fell like a bomb alike at Paris, at Rome, and at Turin, and passions were everywhere set in motion.

Count Walewski was not only indignant at the contents of the Convention, but also because the matter had been kept wholly secret from him, and it cost Napoleon III. much trouble to bring him into friendly relations again with Drouyn de Lhuys.⁴ The French ambassador in London, Prince La Tour

¹ France had proposed to word the article thus: "L'Italie s'engage à respecter le territoire actuel du Saint Père," but this form was too positive for the Italians. Le Comte B. d'Harcourt: *Les quatre ministères de M. Drouyn de Lhuys* (Paris 1882), 160.

² The September Convention is printed in M. d'Azeglio, 286f.

³ The despatch in M. d'Azeglio, p. 289f.

⁴ D'Ideville, 258.

d'Auvergne, condemned the Convention in such strong terms that it was very difficult for Drouyn de Lhuys to deal with him. The ultramontane court faction at Paris was furious, the bishops spoke of treachery, and Roman Catholic fanatics called Napoleon III. "the Pope's Judas." When Dupanloup read the Convention, "a sword pierced his soul," and he immediately thought of "uttering a cry of indignation"—that is, of writing a fresh pamphlet. But he controlled his wrath for the time, and determined to wait and see what the successor of St Peter would say.¹

There was naturally no less exasperation at Rome. People there took their stand immovably on the ground of right, without in the least understanding the French statesmen who wished to accept facts. When Drouyn de Lhuys entrusted the French ambassador, Count de Sartiges, with the task of communicating to Pius IX. the text of the Convention, he added: "Do not ask for any answer. You ought not, by seeking the ratification of Rome, to expose yourself to hearing a direct protest."² As soon as Antonelli read the Convention, he declared to Count de Sartiges, that it was impossible for the Holy See to place any reliance on the word and signature of Piedmont, and that Rome could not acknowledge the boundaries which usurpers had drawn without also acknowledging the usurpation itself. When the Cardinal also expressed hopes of again seeing the Papacy in possession of its old territories, the French ambassador asked upon what he founded his hopes. Antonelli answered, Upon Providence; and upon the miserable condition of the separated provinces. Rome was accustomed to wait, and all the bishops who had been at Rome for the canonisation of the Japanese martyrs had approved of the firmness of the Papacy, and had implored it to hold out.³ A couple of hours after, Count de Sartiges had an interview with the Pope, and he was there met with a similar view of what had happened. The Pope, like Antonelli, expressed his doubts as to the trustworthiness of the Italian government, and he had no confidence in its Conservatism. The offer to take

¹ Lagrange: *Dupanloup* II, 279.

² D'Harcourt: *Les quatre ministères de M. Drouyn de Lhuys*, 191f.

³ Count de Sartiges' despatch of 23rd September 1864 in D'Harcourt, 192f.

over the papal debt he would not accept, for any direct negotiation with the government of Victor Emmanuel would involve a recognition of the right of Piedmont to keep the provinces wrested from St Peter's successor. The Convention had come upon him like a flash of lightning; but he put his trust in the Catholic world, which was on his side. When Count de Sartiges begged Pius IX. to say what he was to write to his government as the result of the interview, the Pope answered: "You can write that the Pope cannot give great hopes, but that he will consider the question carefully, discuss it with the cardinals, and afterwards give you his opinion if you wish to ask him for it—for hitherto everything has been done without me."¹

Amongst the friends of the Kingdom of Italy the indignation at the September Convention was almost greater, especially amongst the most extreme. For it could not be concealed that the Convention in its essence was an alliance between Victor Emmanuel and the French government, directed against the Italian demagogues, who were behaving more and more threateningly. Mazzini, who was always remarkably well-informed of what was going on, wrote on 7th July 1864 to his faithful Diamilla Müller: "I know what is being prepared, but I do not know whether it emanates from the King or from the Ministry."² On 24th July he wrote to the same: "I know that at this moment negotiations are being carried on between Turin and Paris, and that is sufficient for me."³ When he learned the contents of the Convention, he called it an ungodly renunciation of Rome (*la sacrilega rinuncia a Roma*), for it was a cancelling of all the plébiscites and resolutions of Parliament in favour of making Rome the capital of Italy. He immediately broke off his last thread of connexion with the monarchy; hereafter he would be only republican.⁴

The Parliament of Turin, before the conclusion of the September Convention, had passed several orders of the day, which revealed the self-consciousness of the Radical party, and its want of political intelligence and religious sympathy.

¹ The despatch of Count de Sartiges of 24th September 1864 in D'Harcourt, 196f.

² *Politica segreta Italiana*, 110.

³ *Ibid.*, 116.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 194f.

A Radical deputy, for example, demanded that Victor Emmanuel should go to Rome in spite of France; and he ventured to assert that Italy could easily fight, not only France and Austria, but the whole of Europe. The same deputy also expressed the wish that the King of Italy should hereafter appoint the pope and the cardinals on the nomination of his Minister of Justice.¹ The Italian Cabinet, of course, rejected such nonsense, but even a foolish policy like this found supporters in the Parliament which was itself the product of a revolution.

When the Chambers were to be convened to discuss the Convention, and especially the change of capital, the ministry sent Victor Emmanuel a letter, which evinced both moderation and astuteness. In it they say that the Roman question ought to be solved morally, not by force, and in agreement with France. The promise not to attack the Papal States would not be likely to annul or even to diminish the rights and hopes of the nation; and the removal of the capital was a necessity. After the surrender of Savoy and Nice, Turin was too near the French border; Italy must have a capital with a more central situation and strategically more secure. For reasons of national defence the ministry would prefer Florence.²

The change of capital was a singularly difficult question, which affected many personal and local interests. Victor Emmanuel, who called himself *proprio Torinese*, looked upon the departure from his native town as a painful sacrifice upon the altar of his country.³ And the choice of the new capital also stirred up passions. When Drouyn de Lhuys first mentioned the question of removal to the Italian ambassador at Paris, he is reported to have said: "The end of the whole thing will, of course, be that you will go to Rome. But it is important that as long an interval as possible should elapse between this event and the recall of our troops, and that so much should happen in the meantime that it may be impossible to connect the two events together, and to make France responsible for the latter."⁴

¹ D'Harcourt, 161f.

² D'Harcourt, 162f, contains the essentials.

³ Massari: *Vittorio Emanuele II*, 417.

⁴ Massari, 415.

Most Italians cherished the hope that the new capital would only be a station on the way to Rome; but the sensible ones did not give utterance to this hope, and the government could not officially acknowledge it, because the fulfilment of it would be a breach of the September Convention. But it could not be concealed. It appeared immediately when the choice of the new capital was discussed. For many things seemed to point to Naples; but if the chief city of the South were preferred to Florence, it would mean the renunciation of Rome. Victor Emmanuel, who was afraid lest the minister, Pisanelli, who belonged to the southern provinces, should throw too strong a weight into the scales in favour of Naples, even said openly: "If we go to Florence, we may in two, five, or six years' time say good-bye to the Florentines and go to Rome; but if we go to Naples, we must stay there."¹

But in order to calm people's minds he determined to dismiss the ministry which had concluded the September Convention, and on 29th September General La Marmora formed a new one. La Marmora had had great doubts as to the solution of the Roman question adopted by the Convention, especially because he considered that it was impossible for the Italians to defend the difficult frontier of the Papal States, extending over 430 kilometres, against the attacks of armed bands.² Now, however, there was nothing else to be done but loyally to keep the agreement with France. But the position of the government was very difficult, because the impatience of the Italians and the hope of *Roma capitale* constantly found voice in Parliament.

At Paris, and in other places, people did not doubt the good intentions of the new ministers to keep the September agreements, at least for the present; but, on the other hand, there were doubts of their firmness and capacity to arrest the national movement. France endeavoured, therefore, in various ways to make it clear to the Italians, that it was in their own well-understood interest to approach the Papacy. In a conversation which Napoleon III. had with the Marquis Pepoli, on 19th October, he impressed upon him that Italy must in no form

¹ Massari, 419.

² J. White Mario: *Italy, Rome, and the Franco-Prussian war in Cosmopolis* for July 1896, 53f.

whatever urge an attack upon the city of St Peter; at the same time he gave the Marquis to understand that France would not be a quiescent spectator if a revolution forced the Pope to leave Rome.¹ But the French government had to confess that the inclination of the Roman Court "to transfer the immobility of their dogmas to the political sphere" made relations with the Papacy most difficult, whilst, at the same time, it became more and more impossible to bridle the impatience of the Radicals and their annoyance with France. On 10th October Garibaldi had written a letter from Caprera which revealed how furious he was with the September Convention.² "With Bonaparte," thus it ended, "only one convention is possible: to clear our country of his presence, not in the course of two years, but in the course of two hours." Baron Malaret considered this a pretty open appeal to violence, and he asked for instructions from his government, whose answer was: "Take no notice of Garibaldi's letter!" Drouyn de Lhuys considered it best, out of regard to the difficulties of the Italian government, as well as for other reasons, to overlook the letter of the angry general; and after a long, and in many ways painful, debate, the Parliament of Turin decided on 24th November 1864, by a large majority, that Florence should be the capital of the Italian kingdom.

The September Convention aroused the attention of the other Catholic powers; and Spain and Austria proposed, through their ambassadors at Paris, that France should not be the sole surety for the remainder of the Papal States, but that the Catholic powers, by a joint act, should guarantee to St Peter's successor the last remnants of his vanished temporal splendour. Drouyn de Lhuys, however, rejected this proposal. An Italian attack on Rome ought only to be a matter between Italy and France; but at the same time he recognised the obligation of France to interfere if Italy violated the Convention. A collective convention might, in his opinion, easily lead to serious conflicts, and even to a European war.³

¹ The despatch of Drouyn de Lhuys of 20th October 1864, to Baron de Malaret; D'Harcourt, 177f.

² It is printed in D'Harcourt, 180f.

³ The despatch of Drouyn de Lhuys of 7th October 1864 to Baron de Malaret; D'Harcourt, 167f.

The bishops in the Catholic countries looked to Rome in silent expectation, and the Jesuits were busy there. Pius IX., who in his earlier years had had his clear-sighted tutor, Graziosi, and afterwards the priest Stella, for his confessors, had long since chosen a Jesuit for this important office, and until his death he continued to have Jesuit confessors. Sometimes, it is true, he became impatient at the interference of the powerful order in every possible thing, but his confessor represented to him that the order of Loyola worked only for enforcing obedience to the Pope's command, and that it was the best champion against the revolution and the secret societies.¹ Pius IX., therefore, came more and more into the power of the Jesuits.

Shortly before the conclusion of the September Convention two beatifications had taken place, which showed the strength of the Jesuit influence. On 2nd August Peter Canisius had been elevated to a place among the Blessed, that the faithful, at a time "when the Church of God was assailed with ungodly weapons," might have an eminent example to imitate;² and on 19th August the same honour was accorded to Marguerite Marie Alacoque, the parent of the Jesuit cultus of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus.³ Pius IX. had already, by a decree of 23rd August 1856, shown himself a supporter of this curious cultus.⁴ Finally, on the Festival of the Madonna, 8th December, the papal answer to the Convention appeared in the Encyclical *Quanta cura*, with the added Syllabus, or index of the most prominent errors of the time⁵—a still greater testimony to the power of the Jesuits.

Pius IX. recalls in the preface to this circular that he has already several times had occasion to condemn the ungodly ideas (*monstrous opinionum portenta*) which have appeared in our time to the destruction of souls, and to the hurt of the commonwealth. Circumstances now demand a new condemnation, especially of those "who transfer the ungodly principle

¹ Döllinger : *Kl. Schriften*, 593.

² See the brief of beatification in G. Boero *Vita del B. Pietro Canisio* (Roma 1864), 511f.

³ The brief of beatification is in E. Bougaud : *Hist. de la bienheureuse Marguerite Marie* (9th ed., Paris 1894), 558f.

⁴ Printed in H. J. Nix : *Cultus S. S. Cordis Jesu* (Friburgi 1891), 25f.

⁵ Clemens Schrader : *Die Encyklika* (Wien 1865).

of what is called 'naturalism' to civil society," for they wish either to have this ordered and governed regardless of religion, or at least without distinction between the true religion and the false. Next, liberty of conscience, of public worship, and of the Press is condemned, and a warning is given against those who wish to make public opinion the highest authority, and thereby open every road to the race for riches and for pleasure-seeking. Such people also, it says, persecute religious associations with a bitter hatred, and wish to place hindrances in the way of Christian benevolence and of rest on holy days, as if such things were contrary to the principles of political economy. Next, "the destructive error of communism and socialism is condemned," which fails to appreciate the divine order which lies at the foundation of the family, and wishes to deprive the Catholic Church of the instruction and education of the young. The ministers of the Church are exposed to hatred as enemies of progress in science and civilisation, and contempt is shown for the laws of the Church, as if they had no force unless published by secular powers. People disregard the Church's condemnation of secret societies, and the Pope's excommunication of those who attack and usurp the rights and the property of the Church; and disobedience is shown to the decisions of the Roman see. All such things are condemned, and it is the Pope's will that such opinions should be avoided and eschewed by all the children of the Catholic Church.

After this condemnation is uttered, a warning follows against those who deny the Divinity of Christ, and those bishops who have spoken against this denial are praised.¹ Everybody is exhorted to watchfulness and prayer, and a plenary jubilee indulgence is promised for a whole month next year (*Plenaria Indulgentia ad instar Jubilæi*). "But that God may more quickly hear your desires and prayers and those of all the faithful," the document continues, "we will confidently invoke the mediation of the Immaculate and Most Holy Virgin; she has vanquished all false doctrines throughout the world, and she helps all, . . . and since she stands as queen at the right hand of her Only Begotten Son, in a vesture of gold wrought about with divers colours (*in vestitu deaurato circumamicta varietate*), there is nothing which

¹ Especially directed against E. Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, which was published in 1863.

she cannot obtain from Him." Finally, there is an admonition to invoke the intercession of the chief of the apostles, St Peter and St Paul, and all the saints in heaven, "who, sure of their own immortality, are zealous for our salvation."

In the Syllabus, which is added to the Encyclical, pantheism, naturalism, and rationalism are first condemned, the last both in its coarser and in its more refined forms, and under the head of rationalism is reckoned amongst other things the opinion, that the methods and principles of scholastic theology do not agree with the requirements of our time and the progress of science.¹ After rationalism comes the turn of indifferentism, and especially of the "latitudinarian" assertion, that God may be as well pleased in Protestantism as in Catholicism. Then comes the condemnation of socialism, communism, the secret societies, the Bible societies, and the associations of Liberal Catholics, who were enthusiastic for the programme of Cavour: a free Church in a free State. Amongst errors as regards the Church and its privileges, mention is made of the misunderstanding of "the liberty of the Church"; in other words, condemnation is pronounced upon all those who will not acknowledge the Pope's authority to lay his command upon States in such a way that not only family life, the school, and education pass entirely under the control of the Roman Church, but that the Pope may even interfere in all legislation and require its alteration. It is a damnable error to say that Church and State ought to be separated: the Roman Church will uphold the system of State Churches, but in such a way that the State is the obedient handmaid of Rome. Amongst the errors with regard to natural and Christian ethics "the principle of non-intervention" is also reckoned (*principium quod vocant de non-interventu*). It is a matter of course that amongst them is also found the opinion that matters relating to marriage belong to the temporal jurisdiction, and the opinion that it would be well if the temporal power which the Apostolic See possesses were abolished. The last part of the Syllabus is devoted to the errors of Liberalism, and amongst

¹ This was aimed at Döllinger, who at a meeting of Roman Catholic scholars at Munich, in September 1863, had read a paper about *die Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der kath. Theologie* (*Kl. Schriften*, 161f.), which contained bitter sallies against Scholasticism, which is "one-eyed," because it lacks the historical eye.

them is included the view, "that in our time it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be the religion of the State to the exclusion of all other forms of religion." The index ends with the condemnation of the assertion that "the Roman Pontiff can, and must, effect a reconciliation and alliance with progress, liberty, and the new civilisation."

It was on the tenth anniversary of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary that the Encyclical *Quanta cura*, with the annexed Syllabus, was issued. These two documents form an important supplement to the Bull of 8th December 1854, and they are a connecting link between it and the proclamation of the dogma of Infallibility. That Pius IX., just at the end of 1864, should issue such a declaration of war against modern society, was no doubt due to the latest outcome of Franco-Italian politics; but the Encyclical and the Syllabus were more than an answer to the September Convention, and these documents have a previous history, which goes a great way back. Pius IX. had long contemplated building "a lighthouse," which might lead the people who were groping in darkness back to the way of truth.¹

The Jesuits some years ago drew attention to the fact that Leo XIII. may in a way be regarded as the spiritual author of the Syllabus of his predecessor, because, when Bishop of Perugia, he proposed at a provincial synod at Spoleto in November 1849, that the Umbrian bishops there assembled should in all humility, but earnestly, ask Pius IX. to collect and condemn the worst errors of the time as regards the Church, authority, and the rights of property.² At that time Pius IX. had something else to think of, but the Jesuits put the suggestion of the Bishop of Perugia upon their programme. As early as 1851 the *Civiltà Cattolica* expressed the hope that an explicit condemnation of the errors of rationalism and semi-rationalism might be added to the forthcoming Bull of the Immaculate Conception of Mary,³ and shortly afterwards Cardinal Fornari was

¹ Cp. his words to Mgr. Plantier, the Bishop of Nîmes. Maynard: *Mgr. Dupanloup et M. Lagrange, son historien*, 134.

² Cp. Rinaldi: *Il valore del Sillabo* (Roma 1888), reprinted from the *Civiltà Cattolica*. About the meeting at Spoleto see Mgr. de T'serclaes: *Le Pape Léon XIII.* (Paris 1894) I, 156f.

³ K. Rönneke: *Pius IX. Encyklika und Syllabus* (Gütersloh 1891) XIV.

ordered to take such a work in hand. Fornari approached various learned men and bishops, and also, strangely enough, the French journalist, Louis Veuillot, editor of the *Univers*.¹ But several of those who were appealed to for assistance advised that the intended syllabus should be published with a special Bull or Encyclical; and so the Bull of 8th December 1854 was issued without any syllabus.

But in 1854 a committee of theologians—amongst them Perrone, Passaglia, Theiner, and Schrader—embarked on the task. The work proceeded but slowly until an impetus was given from outside. In July 1860, Bishop Gerbet, of Perpignan, a former disciple of Lamennais, whom Sainte-Beuve has called “a Christian Plato,” put forth an *Instruction pastorale sur diverses erreurs du temps présent*. This pastoral letter, which contained eighty-five propositions, in which the false maxims of unbelief and socialism were formulated, with phrases taken from the daily papers and from modern literature,² greatly pleased Pius IX. and his Jesuit surroundings, and a commission was formed to examine and add to the list of errors. Thus there appeared in 1862 a set of *Theses ad Apostolicam Sedem delatæ et Censuræ a nonnullis Theologis propositæ*. This work was laid before the bishops who were summoned to Rome in connexion with the canonisation of the Japanese martyrs. But several of the bishops had their doubts about the publication of such a document at that moment. Dupanloup expressed his surprise that Rome, which had so many excellent theologians, should have taken the pastoral letter of a French bishop as the basis of such an important work,³ and he begged Antonelli to consider what a storm would follow the publication of the theses.⁴ Mgr. Guibert, then Archbishop of Tours, afterwards Archbishop of Paris, thought likewise that it would be unsafe in present conditions to publish a condemnation of various

¹ This is the account of L. Veuillot's brother, in a note to Maynard, 127f. E. Veuillot adds sarcastically: “Si Mgr. Dupanloup, tenu à l'écart de ce travail préliminaire, connut plus tard ce fait, il ne dut pas y trouver une raison d'aimer le syllabus.”

² A. Richard: *Gerbet et Salinis* (Paris 1883), 172f., and his *Les grands évêques de l'église de France* (Paris 1894) I, 206.

³ “Sa surprise eût-elle été la même, si l'emprunt eût été fait à l'un de ses propres mandements?” French Ultramontanism asked bitterly. Maynard, 129.

⁴ Lagrange: *Dupanloup* II, 279.

tenets, which concerned politics rather than religion; in this way men might easily be driven away, whom it was very important to retain.¹ Added to this, Padre Passaglia's paper, *Il Mediatore*, had through an indiscretion got hold of the work of the Roman theologians and published it both in Latin and in an Italian translation, and the gates had thus been opened to a kind of criticism which did not invite Rome at that moment to recognise the work.

It was therefore held back for the present, and Luigi Bilio, together with other Roman theologians, was entrusted with the task of revising the document in the light of the critical remarks made by the bishops. It was not long, however, before the wish to have the much-talked-of syllabus published became in many quarters intense. Ultramontanism needed a helping hand in the battle with Liberal Catholicism, which, both in France and Belgium, had many highly-gifted adherents. In August 1863 a Catholic Congress was assembled at Malines, and Count Montalembert read two papers (on 20th and 21st August) on a free Church in a free State,² which were greeted with enthusiasm by the Liberal Catholics,³ but regarded as heretical by the Ultramontanians. Bishop Pie, of Poitiers, immediately after the Congress at Malines appealed to Pius IX. to cause the prefect of the Congregation of the Index to proceed against the bold utterances of Montalembert concerning liberty of belief, which, in his opinion, were in direct opposition to the briefs and encyclicals of former popes.⁴ The vicar-general of the warlike bishop, who delivered the denunciation to the Pope, was received in audience by Pius IX. on 30th October, and it then appeared that the Pope also had been highly displeased at hearing that Cavour's famous formula had been defended at a Congress of Catholics. "The Church will never," said Pius IX. to the vicar-general of the Bishop of Poitiers, "allow that it is a good thing, or right in principle, that errors and heresies should be preached to Catholic populations." The Pope would like to have freedom of conscience in Sweden and Russia; but he does not wish for it on principle, but

¹ J. Paguette de Follenay: *Vie du Cardinal Guibert* (Paris 1896) II, 337.

² Montalembert: *L'église libre dans l'état libre* (Paris 1865).

³ Mrs Oliphant: *Memoir of Count de Montalembert* (Leipzig 1872) II, 268f.

⁴ The letter in Baunard: *Le Cardinal Pie* II, 214.

only as a means which may be used by Providence to propagate the truth in those countries.¹ Pius IX. and Mgr. Pie were agreed that only in countries where the Catholics were in a minority might religious freedom be wished for by Catholics.

The vicar-general also expressed his expectation that the synodical instruction concerning errors of the time, which Mgr. Pie had in hand, would be especially welcome to the Pope. The Bishop therefore hastened on his work, and in order to strengthen himself for it, and to secure help from the *Regina doctorum*, he resolved that on the first Sunday in Advent he would crown the statue of Our Lady at Poitiers in the name of the Holy See. He then wrote a pastoral letter in Lent 1864, "as a prelude," and, after that, the long-expected *Troisième Synodale sur les erreurs du temps*,² which created wild enthusiasm in the ultramontane camp. A French abbé wrote to him: "You have received the spirit of the new Pentecost, and the gift of explaining to this generation the wonderful works of God." And Louis Veuillot expressed his satisfaction in the following characteristic way: "I had it all in myself, but you have expressed my thoughts. I am now certain that I have got hold of the serpent, and I will find both its head and its tail so that I may know where to set my foot."³

Shortly after, well-informed Jesuit organs, such as the *Revue de Louvain* and the *Civiltà Cattolica*, announced that the Encyclical was ready. The Liberal Catholics in France and Belgium then sent a petition to Pius IX., in which they begged him to keep back the document which he was about to issue. But their prayer was not heard, and on 8th December 1864 the Encyclical was issued, as we know, accompanied by the Syllabus.

Antonelli sent the Syllabus, as well as the Encyclical, to all patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, "that they might keep before their eyes the errors and pernicious doctrines which the Pope himself had condemned and rejected."⁴ The two documents created a great sensation throughout the Catholic

¹ The letter in Baunard: *Le Cardinal Pie* II, 215.

² *Ibid.*, 223f.

³ *Ibid.*, 227.

⁴ Antonelli's letter of 8th December 1864 in Rönneke XIII.

world, but especially in France. French Ultramontanism had for a long time exercised through the Press a very distressing inquisition over those bishops and priests who would not further its efforts on behalf of centralisation, and direct connexion with Rome. Archbishop Sibour had already complained of the ultramontane papers which, under the pretext of defending Rome, insulted bishops and priests, and Montalembert expressed his indignation at the journalists *sans mission et sans pudeur*, who exercised a real terrorism over their ecclesiastical opponents.¹ These ultramontane journalists, headed by Louis Veuillot, were overjoyed when they read the Syllabus, which looked like a modern parallel to the famous or notorious *Dictatus Papæ* of the days of Gregory VII.² But the Liberal Catholics in France trembled when they received this challenge to modern society. Politicians like the Duke de Broglie, Count de Falloux, and Montalembert, at once saw how unwisely the Pope was acting in issuing this declaration of war at so critical a moment for the successor of St Peter; and theologians like Bishop Dupanloup heard with alarm the old notes which the encyclical *Mirari vos* had uttered against Lamennais and his school.³

The French government also felt anxious on account of these documents of political religion. On the 1st January 1865, the *Moniteur* contained a ministerial circular to all the bishops of France, forbidding, until further notice, the publication of the jubilee Encyclical and Syllabus, because they contained propositions that were opposed to the principles of the constitution of the Empire. Four days later, after a closer examination, a decree was issued, which limited the prohibition to the first part of the Encyclical.⁴ But the French *ecclesia militans* was not frightened by the *non placet* of the government. On 2nd January 1865, Mgr. Pie sent to the Minister of Public Worship a protest against the imperial prohibition, which made it impossible for the clergy to defend themselves against the attacks made by ignorant persons upon the Pope's language;

¹ See his letter of 20th June 1864 in Séché : *Les derniers Jansénistes* III, 46f.

² It is no less a person than Padre Curci who draws this parallel in his *Il Vaticano regio* (Firenze 1883), 109f.

³ See above, p. 67f.

⁴ J. Paguella de Follenay : *Le Cardinal Guibert* II, 338.

and on 8th January he read in his cathedral the first part of a pastoral letter containing a condemnation of the godless journals which had outraged religion by their criticism of the Encyclical and the Syllabus. A week later, on St Hilary's Day, he pronounced the conclusion of the pastoral, which appealed to the faithful to wage a war of prayer against the modern representatives of Holofernes and Ahasuerus.¹ Guibert, Archbishop of Tours, likewise sent the minister a protest against the circular, which denied to Catholic prelates a right which was granted to the worst enemies of religion and society;² and Mathieu, Archbishop of Besançon, and Dreux-Brézé, Bishop of Moulins, in spite of the ministerial prohibition, ventured to read the prohibited part of the Encyclical, for which the *Conseil d'Etat* brought an action—an *appel comme d'abus*—against them.³

To many Catholic laymen it was doubtful, after the promulgation of the Encyclical and the Syllabus, how far it would hereafter be permissible to take the oath to a free constitution, which seemed to be condemned by the see of St Peter; and Dupanloup in particular received various enquiries in this direction.⁴ He endeavoured meanwhile to satisfy the enquirers by drawing attention to the difference between the absolute and the relative, between abstract principles and their application to present conditions of life.⁵ In order to be quite sure of his ground he addressed an enquiry to Cardinal Antonelli, and from him he received a letter approving of his distinctions. When the answer of the Cardinal arrived, Dupanloup was on the point of putting forth a pamphlet on "the September Convention and the Encyclical," which made an extraordinary stir.⁶ It was sold out in the course of a couple of hours, and in a few weeks it went through four and thirty editions.⁷

The first part of the pamphlet is directed against the recent

¹ Baunard : *Le Cardinal Pie* II, 230f.

² J. Paguette de Follenay II, 339f.

³ Ollivier : *Nouveau manuel de droit ecclésiastique*, 422f.

⁴ Lagrange : *Dupanloup* II, 289.

⁵ As regards these distinctions see E. Ollivier : *L'église et l'état au Concile du Vatican* (Paris 1879) I, 342f.

⁶ *La Convention du 15 Septembre et l'Encyclique du 8 Décembre* (Paris 1865).

⁷ Lagrange II, 282.

settlement of the Roman question, and here the author found a splendid opportunity of showing his unqualified devotion to the Papacy. But, in the second part, he attempted what has been called "a necessary retreat in order to make good the mistakes of Pius IX."¹ In opposition to the view, which seemed to the general lay intelligence the most natural view, and which was urged by the ultramontane journalists, he endeavoured to prove that the Church had by no means absolutely condemned freedom and progress. He interpreted the individual sections by means of the context in which the papal words originally stood, but without being able to allay his readers' astonishment that the Pope should have allowed his words to be torn from their context and placed in a connexion which gave rise to what appeared to be so complete a misunderstanding. He then explained that words such as liberty, progress, and civilisation are in themselves ambiguous, and that the value of liberty, progress, and civilisation depends upon the meaning attached to the words. He asserted that it was only Radicalism, and not moderate Liberalism, which was struck by the papal condemnation. But Rome, of course, could not be expected to sanction religious liberty on principle. The Church was unable to transform relative necessities into absolute truths, but it could, on the other hand, certainly wink at relative necessities. Neither was it the limited, but only the unlimited, liberty of the Press (*omnimoda libertas*), the liberty to publish "all sorts of ideas" (*conceptus quoscumque*), which was here condemned, in accordance with Gregory XVI.'s encyclical *Mirari vos*. In brief Dupanloup endeavoured partly to tone down the most objectionable points of the Encyclical, partly to show the indisputable truth which lay behind various sections of the papal declaration of war.

The ultramontane journalists accused the Bishop of Orléans of having been guilty of a "transformation" of the Pope's pronouncement, and in private their remarks were still more pointed. "The Encyclical," said Louis Veuillot, for instance, to D'Ideville, "would have united all Catholics; the Bishop of Orléans has made everything doubtful. It is in my opinion a bad action and an evil achievement (*une mauvaise action et*

¹ A. Leroy-Beaulieu : *Les Catholiques libéraux* (Paris 1885), 197.

une méchante œuvre); behind apparent obedience and respect for the Pope, there is disobedience towards him, and amidst independence and criticism the bishop is seen courting the Tuileries. That is my opinion at any rate.”¹ And that was the opinion of many. In ultramontane circles, Dupanloup’s pamphlet was called the *Antisyllabus*, and he and his friends were styled Manichees, because they drew a distinction between religion and politics. People were also offended, because the Bishop of Orléans had taken more pains to say what the Encyclical was not, than what it was. One of the hotspurs of Ultramontanism, the Abbé Gaume, famous for his fight against the classics in the schools, published a so-called *Catéchisme du Syllabus*, intended for people in general, in which Montalembert and the other champions of a free Church in a free State were counted among those hypocrites, who, like the Jansenists, wish to remain in the bosom of the Church although they do not belong to the Church.

But Dupanloup, on the other hand, did not lack support. No one except blind fanatics could fail to see that he had done the chair of St Peter and the Roman Church an essential service by his attempt to minimise the difference between the propositions in the Syllabus and the course of modern thought. The papal nuncio at Paris, and 360 bishops of different countries, sent him more or less warm expressions of their gratitude; and appreciation from Rome was not wanting. The Jesuit, Père de Villefort, announced that Pius IX. had read the book with satisfaction, and that the Jesuit General congratulated the author; and on 4th February a papal letter arrived, conveying official acknowledgment from the successor of St Peter.² Dupanloup’s friends interpreted this letter as an unqualified approval, but his opponents discovered a little wormwood in the sweet cup, a fine rebuke behind the very gracious language.³ The French Catholics were divided into two groups, Dupanloup was the hero of the one; the other set a much higher value on Mgr. Pie. Bishop Mermillod, of Geneva, who desired to be on friendly terms with both wings of the French *ecclesia militans*, said diplomatically: “The Bishop of Poitiers always

¹ D’Ideville: *Journal d’un diplomate en Italie*, 282f.

² Lagrange II, 302f.

³ Baunard II, 235

looks to principles; the Bishop of Orléans always looks to souls. The former wishes to lead souls to principles, the latter wishes to bring principles home to souls." But that no one should be in doubt of the direction in which Mermillod's greatest sympathy lay, he added: "But principles can not be brought into confusion."

The difference between the two views of the papal encyclical made its appearance in other countries also. In England where Manning, then recently appointed Archbishop of Westminster, preached a sermon in defence of the Syllabus,¹ William George Ward maintained that there was no need whatever of theological explanations of the Pope's words, which, in his opinion, were perfectly plain. Others, however, like Newman, insisted that only a *schola theologorum* could interpret such documents in the right way, and he spoke bitterly of the great difference between the pure air on the top of St Peter's rock and the "malaria" of imprudence, which prevailed in Rome.² Similar utterances also fell from others; and in Belgium, where the Roman Church and Liberalism had entered a generation before into a political compact, there was so great a commotion about the papal syllabus, that the *Civiltà Cattolica* had to hasten to declare that neither the Belgian constitution nor the rights and duties of Belgian citizens were affected by the documents of 8th December 1861.³

In order to give further satisfaction to the French, Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, took the liberty in a pastoral letter of apostrophising the Pope in the following bold words: "Thy reproof is mighty, thou vicar of Jesus Christ, but thy blessing is still mightier. God has set thee in the Apostle's chair, between the two halves of this century, in order to close the one half and inaugurate the other. Thou art he who shall defend reason and faith, liberty and authority, policy and the Church."⁴ But the Archbishop of Paris was not, and never became, a favourite of Pius IX. and of the Jesuits. He was

¹ Purcell: *Manning* II, 214.

² W. Ward: *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival* (London 1893), 241f. Cp. Gladstone's book, *Rome and the newest fashions in religion*, 13.

³ *Civiltà Cattolica*, February 1865, quoted in Leroy-Beaulieu, 208.

⁴ Foulon: *Mgr. Darboy*, 329.

accused of Febronianism. Pius IX. sent him a letter of disapproval,¹ and a short time afterwards, when Count Beust quoted some words of the French archbishop to the papal nuncio at Vienna, he received the answer: "You are perhaps not aware that Mgr. Darboy is anything but an authority for the Holy See."²

Even after the Italian Parliament had passed the bill for the transfer of the capital to Florence, the September Convention continued to cause serious difficulties to the government at Turin. On 30th January 1865, such disquieting tumults took place in front of the royal palace at Turin, where a court ball was taking place, that Victor Emmanuel considered it best a couple of days afterwards to leave his palace and his old capital without warning, and by a back door.³ On his way to Moncalieri he met a priest carrying the sacrament to a dying person, and, according to his custom, the King alighted from his carriage and knelt in the road. As soon as this was reported at Turin, the journal *Diritto* wrote in injured tones, that the last the people of Turin had heard of their King was that "he had allowed himself to be blessed by one of the representatives of the Pope." But on 14th February Victor Emmanuel received at the hunting-box of San Rossore, near Pisa, certain envoys from Turin, who begged him to return, and on their earnest supplications the King was persuaded to go back to his native town. On that very 14th February when the King received the envoys from Turin, Mazzini wrote his confidential agent a letter, in which he reported that Napoleon III. was frequently at death's door through fainting fits. He hoped therefore that the dawn of liberty would soon again rise over France, so that he might resume, with hope of a successful issue, his republican mission in Italy, where the time of the dynasty was past, because it had become clear that Victor Emmanuel was really only one of the prefects of Napoleon III.⁴

A fresh quarrel indeed soon sprang up between the King of Italy and a portion of his subjects. At the opening of

¹ Séché: *Les derniers Jansénistes* III, 200f.

² F. F. Graf von Beust: *Aus drei Viertel-Jahrhunderten* (Stuttgart 1887) II, 137.

³ Massari, 422f.; *Politica segreta Italiana*, 207f.

⁴ Mazzini's letter in *Politica segreta Italiana*, 222f.

the French Chamber of Deputies Napoleon made a speech, in which he declared that the removal of the Italian capital meant the abandonment of the hope of incorporating Rome with Italy; and he also let fall some words which were interpreted by some as a threat to deprive Italy of Piedmont. On 13th March the North Italian journal *Le Alpi* reported that a secret protocol had been signed at the September Convention containing particulars about a "rectification of the frontier" between France and Italy.¹ On 23rd March Massari addressed an interpellation to the government on the subject; but as both La Marmora and the former Foreign Secretary, Visconti-Venosta, positively denied the report, the story was thereafter only believed where confidence in the royal house had been previously shaken.

Since 1860 Victor Emmanuel had fallen a second time under the ban of the Church, and thus direct connexion between him and the Curia had for some years been completely broken. But in the Vatican there was in fact far greater sympathy for him than for Napoleon III. Those who were offended because the French Emperor partook of the Holy Communion on Good Friday, at the same time that he was meditating to destroy the temporal power of the Pope, considered it correct for the King of Italy to refrain from performing his paschal duties. "The Pope's Judas celebrates Easter," they said, "but not Victor Emmanuel. Why not? Because Victor Emmanuel has religion in his heart, but Napoleon III. has it under his heel."² In 1862, when Victor Emmanuel's daughter, Maria Pia, celebrated her wedding with the King of Portugal, the Pope sent his congratulations to his god-daughter; and in the letter he let fall some complaints of the pitiful condition of religion and its ministers in Italy, and a wail of woe over him who employed such methods towards the Church.³ No answer was sent to this letter, but as more and more Italian bishoprics became vacant, Pius IX. considered that he ought no longer to be silent. In March, 1865, he suggested to Victor Emmanuel that he should send a representative to Rome to open

¹ Mazzini's letter in *Politica segreta Italiana*, 200.

² *Histor.-polit. Blätter* 1889, II, 449.

³ The letter in *Civiltà Cattolica*, 17th August 1889, 412.

negotiations about the vacant sees. The King thereupon despatched the former minister, Vegezzi, to Rome, and gave him a letter in which he declared that he still heartily desired to find a way of reconciliation with the Holy See.¹ During the negotiations about the episcopal appointments, other questions were also treated of. Victor Emmanuel was willing to drop the oath which the bishops took to the government, but Rome demanded that the bill for dissolving the religious corporations should be withdrawn; and since an agreement could not be reached Vegezzi's mission was ineffectual.²

During these negotiations the internal strife at the Vatican continued. At the end of October, 1865, Antonelli finally succeeded in getting rid of his old antagonist, the Minister of War, De Mérode, and the Jesuit party thereby lost a strong support in the immediate surroundings of Pius IX. De Mérode's fall was partly due to a definite request from France for the removal of this intransigent politician, partly to the recognition that his unreasonable dreams of revenge might bring matters to such a point that the Maritima and the Campagna would be lost in the same way as Umbria and the Marches.³ It caused great uneasiness at the Vatican that Spain also now recognised the Kingdom of Italy; and when 3,000 French soldiers, according to the September Convention, left Rome to return to their country by way of Civit  Vecchia, people began to fear a revolution at Rome. Shortly after the French troops had left, the recognition by Bavaria and Saxony was reported; and when the Italian Parliament met for the first time at Florence, Victor Emmanuel delivered a speech from the throne which caused serious anxiety at Rome, because it announced a bill for the separation of Church and State and for the suppression of the religious corporations.⁴ At the same time the cholera was threatening; bands of brigands made the Campagna so unsafe that well-to-do citizens dared not leave their houses except under the escort of soldiers; and the papal government was making vain efforts to raise a big loan.

To these misfortunes, lastly, was added a complete breach with Russia. At the New Year's lev e, 1866, the Russian

¹ Letter of 5th April 1865 in *Civilt  Cattolica*, 413f.

² Massari, 426. Gregorovius, 299f.

³ Gregorovius, 311f.

⁴ Massari, 427, contains the speech. Cp. Gregorovius, 313f.

secretary of legation, Baron von Meyendorff, took the liberty of telling Pius IX. that the disturbances in Poland were owing to the support which the Polish revolution found at Rome. The Pope was so enraged that he immediately showed the young diplomatist the door, and Antonelli thought the matter so serious that he despatched a courier the same evening to Vienna in order to influence the Russian Court through the papal nuncio there. But before the news of the painful scene had reached St Petersburg by this means, Baron von Meyendorff had himself reported the matter to Gortschakoff, who approved of his behaviour, and without giving Rome any official information of the fact recalled the Russian legation.¹ By the end of March the Russian chapel was closed and the Imperial arms were taken down, and on 4th December (22nd November old style) an Ukase was finally published, abrogating all Russia's agreements with the see of St Peter.²

It was one consolation, however, that France apparently intended to keep faithfully to the September Convention. Even a politician like Thiers had appeared in the Legislative Assembly as a defender of the temporal power to the delight of the French bishops.³ At the beginning of February 1866, Pius IX. concluded a treaty with Napoleon III., according to which the Emperor lent to Rome 2,000 mercenary troops, who were to wear the papal uniform. At the same time, in order to strengthen the moral defences of St Peter's see, the *Civiltà Cattolica* was converted into a regular publication, so that the editors of the journal were hereafter to form a *collegium scriptorum*, which was placed under the Jesuit General and had its habitation in the Borgo in close proximity to the Vatican.⁴

Shortly after the breach with Russia other still darker clouds appeared in the sky of the Vatican. On 8th April, 1866, Italy formed that alliance with Prussia which made Victor Emmanuel the confederate of Prussia in the war

¹ The justification of Rome is found in *Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del S. P. Pio IX. a riparo dei mali che soffre la chiesa Cattolica nei dominii di Russia e di Polonia* (Roma 1866).

² Stepischneff: *Papst Pius IX. und seine Zeit* II, 120. D'Ideville, 39f., and Gregorovius, 318f., 323.

³ J. Pagnelle de Follenay: *Le Cardinal Guibert* II, 345f.

⁴ Gregorovius, 325.

between Prussia and Austria. The Emperor Francis Joseph begged Pius IX. to declare that Austria was in the right; but a letter from Napoleon III. to Drouyn de Lhuys caused the Pope's hand to drop when it was lifted up to bless Austria.¹ And the war between the two great German powers had momentous results for the see of St Peter. It was the old Catholic imperial house which had to cede the hegemony in Germany to Protestant Prussia, which had sprung up at the time of the Reformation, and which by its very name called to mind the spoliation of the monkish knights, and whose royal crown was an affront to the Holy Roman Empire. German prelates like Bishop von Ketteler, of Mainz, were deeply grieved over "the unhappy war of brothers," which cast Roman Catholic Austria out of Germany, and realised the revolutionary programme of Gotha. Immediately after the end of the war Von Ketteler complained that the Catholic Church was in every direction more and more deprived of the defence and support of the secular arm,² and both Windthorst and Majunke date the beginning of the Prussian *Kulturkampf* from the battlefield of Königrätz. After the Prussian war the outcry for the abolition of the Austrian Concordat became still louder at Vienna. In May, 1867, Dr Herbst proposed in the Austrian Chamber of Deputies that a new marriage code should be established, and that the schools should be set free from the Church; and the Town Council of Vienna presented an address to the Chamber of Deputies, in which they declared that a complete abolition (*Nichtigerklärung*) of the Concordat—"that baleful agreement by which the inhabitants of Austria, as regards their most sacred possession and rights, are exposed to the arbitrary pleasure of a foreign power"—was the first and most indispensable step towards a better order of things.³ This was the beginning of an acrimonious internal strife, which at last ended in the abandonment of that Concordat, which had formerly been received with so much rejoicing at Rome.

The war of 1866 had also a great influence upon Italy's

¹ Gregorovius, 330.

² *Briefe von und an W. E. Freiherrn von Ketteler*, herausgegeben von J. M. Raich (Mainz 1879), 342, 347.

³ Wolfsgruber: *Cardinal Rauscher*, 189f.

relation to the Papacy. Since Victor Emmanuel had received Venice from Napoleon III., the thoughts of Italian politicians were even more than formerly turned towards the acquisition of Rome, and the watchword of *Roma capitale* was heard throughout the peninsula with a new strength and with bolder hope. The Roman question again came to the front, but its solution was still hampered by the uncompromising attitude of the Papacy, and by the impatience of the Italians.

In accordance with the September Convention, Napoleon III. gradually recalled his troops. At the end of October, 1866, the French army of occupation sold its belongings in St Angelo, and the whole Ghetto assembled to do business, so that the Piazza Pia looked like a market-place. On 11th December the tricolour was taken down from St Angelo, and the papal banner was hoisted beside the archangel. Three days after, the last French troops were shipped from Cività Vecchia,¹ so that, as Victor Emmanuel said on 15th December in his speech from the throne, the country was at last freed from all foreign dominion.²

Before the outbreak of war between Prussia and Austria, a Foreign Legion of Frenchmen had already assembled at Antibes, between Nice and Cannes, for the protection of the Pope. At the end of September, 1866, the Antibes legion arrived in Rome, and Pius IX. blessed these warriors who were filled with a fanatical enthusiasm for the see of St Peter; and in order to fortify them for impending battles, he personally distributed images of the Madonna to them.³ The Antibes legion occupied the Piazza Barberini and the adjoining part of Rome, while the papal zouaves took up their quarters in the Borgo and St Angelo. There were papal riflemen besides, so that Rome at the end of 1866 had a garrison of about 7,000 men.⁴ The "Antiboines" were from the first a thorn in the flesh to the Italians; the legion was in reality, as Jules Simon said in the French Legislative Assembly,⁵ an indirect support of the Pope instead of the direct, which could no longer be given, because the term

¹ Gregorovius, 339, 347.

² Speech in Massari, 452.

³ Gregorovius, 336.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 346f.

⁵ *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 7th December 1867.

fixed by the September Convention for the French occupation had now expired.¹ The Antibes soldiers were in every respect looked upon as a French corps. If they were caught as deserters, they were to be punished according to French law, and when General Dumont reviewed them in July 1867, he took the opportunity of reminding them that they belonged to the French army, although they were in garrison at Rome.

As 7,000 men were not a sufficient force for the defence of the papal lands, a fresh proposal was made by one of the Roman Catholic powers for the signing of a protocol, the subscribers to which were to pledge themselves to maintain the inviolability of the much diminished papal territories. Once again the attempt to place the Pope under European protection failed. But in order to instigate Victor Emmanuel to a loyal fulfilment of the September Convention, and to free himself from every suspicion of a secret understanding with those who cried *Roma o morte!* Napoleon III. despatched Count Fleury to Florence.² The French ambassador was received with all due attention, and Victor Emmanuel promised to defend the Pope's territories against all attacks; but he declared also that he would not acquiesce in any act which might be interpreted as putting an end to the hopes of the Romans and of the Italians at large. And when the general hinted that the Roman Catholic powers would place thousands of bayonets at the Pope's disposal, the King answered proudly that he also had soldiers to defend his rights.

A few days afterwards he opened the Chambers with the speech from the throne which has been already mentioned. In it he not only expressed his satisfaction that the foreigners had withdrawn, but declared at the same time that, while intending to remain faithful to the religion of his forefathers, he would do so without abandoning his loyalty to those principles of liberty which had found expression in the political institutions of Italy, and which, when followed in uprightness

¹ The formation of the Antibes legion was several times the object of diplomatic negotiations between the Courts of Florence and Paris. See the *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 15th December 1867, *Beilage*, following "the green book."

² Massari, 450f.

and large-mindedness, would be able to remove the causes of the ancient strife between Church and State, and secure the Pope's independence at Rome.¹ The answer of the Chamber of Deputies to this speech from the throne contained the following words: "Since the withdrawal of the French troops, the Eternal City still witnesses that confused and fermenting mixture of matters divine and human, which demands a decisive settlement. We will wait for that settlement, whilst inculcating freedom of conscience and fidelity to engagements, but at the same time perseveringly making ourselves the mouthpiece of the national endeavours."

The distinguished lawyer and canonist, Michelangelo Tonello, was shortly afterwards sent to Rome to reopen the negotiations which Vegezzi had not been able to bring to a successful issue.² By taking each case by itself, without touching upon the question of principle, an agreement was this time reached as to the filling up of the vacant Italian sees. At the same time several letters were exchanged between Victor Emmanuel and Pius IX. But to the Pope the King of Italy was still only "the King of Sardinia," and only as such Pius IX. sent him his blessing. Victor Emmanuel himself mentioned this delicate distinction in a letter, in which he wrote to the Pope that he had read in books approved of by the Church that God had sometimes made use of a pope for the chastisement of a king, and *vice versa*; he hoped that Pius IX., even if he could not recognise and bless the King of Italy, could at least recognise and bless in him one of the instruments of Providence for the attainment of a goal which was yet in the clouds.³

Baron Ricasoli, however, would not rest content with procuring shepherds for shepherdless dioceses; he was resolved also to work in Cavour's steps for making the principle of liberty effectual in the relations between Church and State. He and his friends felt most inclined to leave a small territory to the successor of St Peter—the Leonine part of Rome, a harbour, and Castel Gandolfo; and he wished for a peaceful solution of the Roman question.⁴ He allowed all

¹ Massari, 453.

² See above, p. 272.

³ Massari, 459.

⁴ *Allg. Zeitung, Beilage*, 1st May 1896.

the bishops, who had been deprived of their sees for defying the government, to return, but declared also that they would be punished if they were again guilty of breaking the laws of the kingdom. On 15th November 1866 he sent to all the prefects in Italy a circular letter, in which he assured them, that in religious questions the government meant to maintain the law of liberty, so that the ministers of religion should neither be martyrs nor occupy a privileged position. On the 7th December, Paris and Florence agreed that Italy, as her part of the debt of the Papal States, was to pay a little more than 20,500,000 francs in cash on 15th March 1867 at the latest, and should annually pay interest on a state debt of nearly 18,500,000.¹ On 20th December, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Visconti-Venosta, sent a note to Nigra, the Italian ambassador at Paris, in which he promised loyally to observe the September Convention, but declared at the same time that a discussion of the principle underlying the Roman question would be totally useless, whether the discussion took place between the Holy See and Italy, or between Italy and other governments. Italy would welcome any measures which might help the papal *enclave* to share as much as possible in the common life of the nation, and assist the Romans to participate in the advantages which the King's subjects enjoyed. It was also the wish of Italy that the Holy Father should remain at Rome, independent, honoured, and in possession of those prerogatives and guarantees which were necessary for the carrying out of his high mission, and especially that he should be free from every relation to the secular powers involving his subjection to them. The papal sovereignty must now appear in a new shape. Nevertheless, Italy desired that the change should take place freely and without hindrance, without pressure from outside, in such a way as the dignity and rights of the Pope and of the Romans required. Italy would work for unity as to extradition of criminals, restoration of the consulates, and various reductions of custom duties; and Italy hoped that the spirit of the September Convention would survive the stipulations contained in the agreement of 15th September 1864, if these should prove to be transient. But if the Imperial government were to abandon the principle of non-intervention, the Roman question would

¹ E. Arnd: *Fem Aars Historie* (Copenhagen 1874), 88f.

again call forth on both sides the regrettable deeds of violence which had formerly characterised it.¹

On the day after Visconti-Venosta had posted this note, Nigra sent him a despatch, in which he reported the substance of a conversation with the Marquis de Moustier. The French minister had complained that the Roman government was far from being as conciliatory in political matters as France had expected. For instance, it would not allow papal subjects to receive the civil and political rights of Italian citizens, and as regards various administrative reforms, the matter of customs, and so forth, the Holy See would not enter upon any arrangement whatsoever. The Marquis de Moustier hoped, however, that a *modus vivendi* might be found, since Antonelli himself considered such a thing necessary. But he declared also that the Emperor might feel constrained to undertake a new Roman expedition, in case the Pope were obliged, on account of a revolution or an invasion, to leave Rome. The two diplomatists, however, agreed that neither Italy nor France, under any circumstances, was to take action until an attempt had first been made to come to a mutual understanding. Visconti-Venosta entirely approved of this conclusion, but he also asked Nigra to affirm that a fresh foreign intervention at Rome ought to be out of the question, because it was a violation of the principles of Italian policy.²

The financial embarrassment of Italy, however, tempted the Italian government to carry on a home policy in which the Papacy could only see a violation of divine and human rights.

On 17th January 1867, the Minister of Finance, Scialoia, and the Minister of Justice, Borgatti, laid before the Chamber of Deputies two bills which attracted great attention. The one contained in six articles the outlines of the subsequent Law of Guarantees of 1871; the other proposed to put the finances of the kingdom on a sound footing by the sale of church property. What the sale brought in was to be handed over to the Church, that is to say, to the bishops, with a deduction of 600,000,000 francs, which were to be delivered to the State. The bishops were also to have permission to buy back the church property

¹ *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung*, 15th December 1867, *Beilage*, following "the green book."

² Note of 9th January, *loc. cit.*

if they wished to do so. Ricasoli had already entered into an agreement with the Belgian banking firm of Langrand-Dumanceau, which was to pay the 600,000,000 francs, and to undertake the liquidation of the church property; but these proposals, and especially the last, met with opposition on all sides. The majority in the Chamber were afraid of placing such large sums at the free disposal of the bishops, and from Venetia, in particular, strong protests were heard against the bills. Ricasoli's prohibition of the continuation of the popular assemblies in Venetia led to a constitutional conflict; and when a dissolution of the Chamber of Deputies merely brought about a situation still more unfavourable to the government and its proposals, Ricasoli gave place to Rattazzi. But the new Cabinet was obliged to adopt the same scheme for the sale of the church property; and after stormy debates a bill was finally passed in August, which not only secured the 600,000,000 francs for the empty treasury, but also transferred the rest of what the sale brought in to the State, on the condition that it undertook to pay the priests their salaries.¹ Thus the arrangement of the French Revolution and the French Concordat was brought into effect in Italy, but without any agreement with Rome, which saw in the new law only an impious sacrilege.

It can easily be understood that the Papacy did not come to feel more safe under these circumstances—all the less so as Garibaldi and his friends openly announced that they would not rest content with the decisions of the September Convention. At the close of 1866 deputations even came to Caprera to appeal to the General to undertake a new expedition against Rome. In February, 1867, he travelled about in Venetia and delivered speeches, ending with the refrain of *Roma o morte!* and in March he was agitating for *Rome capitale* in Piedmont and Tuscany. At the beginning of September he was at Geneva, where a congress of working men and a peace congress were being held, which at his instigation passed a resolution that the Papacy ought to be abolished, and "God's religion" adopted. After his return from the congress he spoke openly of overthrowing the Papacy, and he declared that the cholera, which was then raging in Italy, did less harm than the Roman priests.

¹ Massari, 461f. Arnd, 91f.

In the midst of all this agitation Pius IX. gathered around him bishops from all parts of Christendom for the celebration of the eighteen-hundredth anniversary of the martyrdom of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, in the time of Nero. This centenary, which as Manning said,¹ was also to be a festival of "St Peter's primacy over the whole world," assembled altogether 490 bishops and prelates, all the Eastern patriarchs in communion with Rome, and nearly 14,000 priests, in the city of St Peter. The Italian Press spoke scornfully of this "migration of the crows" (*il passaggio delle cornucchie*) which daily brought large flocks of black-robed figures to Rome. There came vivacious little Frenchmen, bearing the stamp of pride as belonging to "the great nation"; quiet, dignified, and elegant Spaniards in Don Bartolo hats; stout Germans, rough in their manners, most of them from the Tyrol, Bavaria, and Austria; Slavs with whiskers; Orientals in magnificent dresses, looking like the patriarchs of the Old Testament; yellow Chinamen; black and brown bishops and prelates from Africa and India; one of these exotic archbishops is even said to have worn a ring in his nose. The Italians formed the setting of the foreign types; they moved about with the ease of those born in the country, and they were proud of being the Church's life-guard, in contradistinction to the foreign auxiliaries.²

Festivals, illuminations, and musical services followed one upon another. The assembled prelates, with inward satisfaction, heard the Pope renew in St Peter's church the excommunication of "the King of Sardinia" and his accomplices, in the hope that "the thunder of heaven," which at that time was audible everywhere amongst the nations, would bring the enemies of the Church to reason. Those who understood Latin were deeply moved by this parallel to the excommunications pronounced by mediæval popes upon secular princes, and were proud to hear Pius IX. express his conviction that a secret power emanated from the grave of the Prince of the Apostles, which could strengthen and kindle the bishops to the fight against the audacity of the foe.³ And it caused universal

¹ Friedrich: *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils* I, 679.

² Gregorovius, 361.

³ Baunard: *Le Cardinal Pie* II, 299f. Gillet: *Pie IX., sa vie et les actes de son pontificat* (Münster 1894), 307f.

excitement, when Pius IX., in his allocution, revealed his project of holding a General Council, which might bring to the Kingdom of Christ the victory over its enemies.¹ The chief solemnity was celebrated on 29th June. St Peter's was then splendidly illuminated, and 400 archbishops and bishops in gold brocade, with shining mitres on their heads and tapers in their hands, walked in procession into the immense space to witness the canonisations that were to take place. Painted pictures of the martyrdom of the new saints, twenty feet high, were carried into the church as banners; relatives or countrymen held the tassels of these strange standards. Attention centred chiefly round the picture which represented a Spanish inquisitor, the Canon Don Pedro Arbués de Epila, who had been murdered in 1485. His canonisation was a solemn approval of the Spanish Inquisition and its horrors. The Jesuits were jubilant over the new saint, but many earnest Roman Catholics, who were acquainted with Arbués' proceedings, considered that the canonisation of this bloodthirsty inquisitor was a breach of the old rule of the Church: *Martyrem non facit poena sed causa*.²

The difficult situation of Rome had thrown dark shadows over these festal days, and the financial stress was as pressing in the Vatican as in the Palazzo Pitti. But many of the foreign bishops brought with them rich gifts. Mgr. Pie, zealous and faithful as ever, was the bearer of 45,000 francs as Peter's pence, another amount for the upkeep of twenty-six papal Zouaves, and 40,000 francs besides for new breech-loading rifles.³ There was again need of soldiers to guard against the dangers that threatened the last remnants of the Pope's temporal power.

The Marquis de Moustier found it necessary to remind the Italian government that it was its duty to prevent any attack upon Rome. Rattazzi answered that Italy had both the will and the means to do so. Garibaldi's proceedings, however, at

¹ The allocution of 26th June 1867 in *Acta et decreta Sacr. Conc. Recent. (Collectio Lacensis. Friburgi 1890) VII, 1029f.*

² Döllinger: *Kl. Schriften*, 287f. Gregorovius, 362: "Als die Standarte des grässlichen Inquisitors Pedro de Arbués aus den Colonnaden trat, sank sie zu Boden und riss ein paar Menschen mit sich. Ich sah das mit grosser Schadenfreude."

³ Baunard: *Le Card. Pie II*, 306.

the peace congress at Geneva, and afterwards on his tour in Northern Italy, caused the greatest uneasiness amongst the friends of the Papacy, and Bishop Dupanloup again appeared in the lists on behalf of the threatened Papal States. On 20th September, four French journals published simultaneously an open letter from the Bishop of Orléans to the Italian Prime Minister, intended to induce him to make a declaration that Italy would never lay hands upon the Pope.¹ Dupanloup's letter was read with the greatest attention at the Tuileries. The Empress once more began to move, and a French fleet was got ready to transport troops from Toulon to Cività Vecchia in case Rome should be threatened. As Rattazzi, on 23rd September, gave orders for the arrest of Garibaldi, the sailing of the fleet was for the time being delayed; and when Garibaldi was brought a prisoner to Alessandria, and afterwards taken to Caprera, Dupanloup believed that the danger was past. The Italian warships, which constantly cruised round Caprera, prevented Garibaldi for a while from placing himself at the head of the volunteers who gathered together on the Roman frontier; but his son, Menotti, undertook the leadership in his father's place, and at Florence a central committee was formed which worked openly for the conquest of Rome. Rattazzi still hoped that a popular rising—which had not been taken into account by the September Convention—would open the gates of Rome for the Italians; he winked therefore at the volunteer movement. He had overlooked the fact that Antonelli and the papal police had long ago taken care to have all troublesome persons expelled from Rome, and that Pius IX. was very popular with the lower classes among the Romans. In order to satisfy France, he told the Marquis de Moustier that a cordon of 40,000 soldiery was drawn round the papal *enclave*—undoubtedly a great exaggeration. In reality, it is said that there were only 15,000 men on the papal frontier, and they were not in a position to defend it against attacks. Napoleon III. therefore sent an ultimatum to the Court of Florence, which required that Italy should prevent the volunteers from overstepping the borders of the Papal States, that the recruiting offices should be closed, and that the government should remind the Italians of their duty to keep the September Convention.

¹ Lagrange: *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup* III, 44f.

If Victor Emmanuel wished to avoid war with France, he could not but fulfil the demands of Napoleon III. The recruiting offices at Florence were therefore closed, and the force near the papal territory was augmented. But by this means the Rattazzi ministry lost the popular favour, and Italy again stood face to face with a ministerial crisis, the end of which was that Menabrea, after surmounting various difficulties, formed a new ministry. But it was in dangerous circumstances that the brave general, on 27th October 1867, took charge of the helm of State.

On a dark night Garibaldi succeeded in evading the Italian cruisers, and a North American vessel brought him to Florence. There he delivered exciting speeches in the old style, and the revolutionary central committee in the capital, inflamed by his presence, urged an advance upon Rome. Garibaldi himself proceeded southwards; on 23rd October he reached the border of the Papal States, and his red shirts began at once in small bands to cross the frontier. Under such circumstances there was nothing else for Victor Emmanuel to do but to dissociate himself from the policy of the volunteers. On 27th October he issued a proclamation to his people,¹ in which he declared that the free corps, who had invaded the papal territory, were acting without authority from him or from the recently formed Cabinet, and he disclaimed any idea of wishing to injure the Pope's spiritual power. General La Marmora, who had been sent to Paris to influence Napoleon III., exerted all his strength, in conjunction with the Cavaliere Nigra and the Marchese Pepoli, to induce the Emperor to abandon the plan of a new intervention. But the eloquence of the Italian diplomatists was wasted. On 28th October the French fleet left Toulon, and two days later a French auxiliary corps under General Failly entered the Porta del Popolo. Garibaldi by that time had already occupied Monterotondo² (the ancient Mons Eretum) a few miles from Rome, and it was his intention, if the attack on Rome should fail, to go by Tivoli, where he expected reinforcements, to the Abruzzi, in order from there to set in motion the South Italian Radicals. The Italians, however, under General Cialdini, had crossed the papal frontier in order to stop the progress of

¹ Printed in Massari, 471f.

² A. G. Barili: *Con Garibaldi alle porte di Roma* (Milano 1895), 182f.

the volunteers; but before the Italian troops reached the Garibaldists, General Kanzler, who led the papal army, had made ready for the attack. On 3rd November, early in the morning, 5,000 papal soldiers, reinforced by 2,000 French, advanced against the volunteers, whom they encountered near Mentana. The papal troops were repulsed, but when the French came to the rescue the Garibaldians were forced to retire, after suffering heavy loss. Garibaldi himself was again taken prisoner and brought invalided to Caprera; but, in order not to give the friends of the Papacy in Italy and elsewhere any ground for complaint, the Italians immediately withdrew their troops from the Papal States. This was not done without self-constraint; it affronted the national feeling of the Italians very much to be obliged to leave the Papal States, while the French were allowed to remain there.

A fresh affront was inflicted upon them when the French minister, Rouher, declared on 5th December 1867, during the debate in the Legislative Assembly on the Italian question, that Italy would "never" obtain Rome and the rest of the old Papal States.¹ Rouher's *jamaïs* caused the greatest excitement everywhere. Jules Favre in his indignation at the Conservative policy of the government described the meeting of 5th December as a counterpart to the meeting in the Racquet Court, and the Italians were furious when they read the words of the French minister. At the very time that Rouher was speaking, Menabrea had declared, in the Chamber of Deputies at Florence, that Cavour's programme was still the programme of Italy, and that Rome was as important for Italy as Paris was for France.² Rouher's *jamaïs* therefore sounded like a challenge, and Victor Emmanuel exclaimed indignantly: "We will teach him—*jamaïs*" (*Aj mostrerouma Jamaïs*), and he was not appeased until Rouher had apologised, and declared that the obnoxious word had escaped him in the heat of debate.³

But the Menabrea ministry was so weak upon its feet that the Chamber refused it a vote of confidence, and Italy was again thrown into a painful ministerial crisis, which ended in Menabrea remaining in power after exchanging some unpopular

¹ Rouher's speech in the *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 9th December 1867.

² *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 11th December 1867.

³ Massari, 478.

ministers for others who were more acceptable to the national feeling and to the Radicals. But the new ministry was not more successful than the former in inducing France to recall her auxiliary corps. The Marquis de Moustier informed Nigra that the new occupation was a necessary consequence of Garibaldi's last rising, and that affairs in Europe and Italy were of such a nature that France would not be able to justify the recall of her soldiers. Menabrea therefore declared in the Chamber that for the present the government would abstain from making any more proposals to France, since these could only serve to show how great was the difference of opinion between the two countries with regard to Rome.

In the autumn of 1867 Gladstone came to Rome, and Manning and others entertained great expectations from the famous statesman's sojourn in the Eternal City.¹ The Archbishop of Westminster begged his Roman friends to be sure to show Gladstone every possible attention. The ex-minister had long been silent about Rome and the temporal power of the Pope, but he had declared himself in favour of the Pope's independence; it was therefore possible that he might be won as an ally. But Manning uttered a warning against Lord Clarendon, who was also in the south, with a *Cavete ab hominibus!* Massari relates that Lord Clarendon, who brought a greeting from Victor Emmanuel to Pius IX., besought the Pope to bless the King of Italy. After giving several reasons against doing such a thing, Pius IX. said at last that he did not trust in armed forces, but only in the miracles of Providence. The noble lord is reported to have replied: "Providence can certainly do miracles, and it has done many in the last ten years; but, Holy Father, they have all been in favour of Italy."²

Thus the conversation ended. The well-informed writer, who, under the name of "Spectator," wrote the ecclesiastical leaders every month during a long period in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, says that he received from a trustworthy source an account of an interview, which Gladstone, Lord Clarendon, and a third well-known English statesman had together with Pius IX.³ The English politicians derived the impression from

¹ Purcell: *Cardinal Manning* II, 398f.

² Massari, 482.

³ *Allg. Zeitung* for 1st May 1896.

the conversation with the Pope, that a peaceful solution of the Roman question, in spite of all that had happened, was by no means impossible. On their way home they informed the government at Florence of their observations, and the government accordingly sent a clerical representative to the Vatican, in order that in a secret audience he might influence Pius IX. in the direction of a peaceful settlement. When the representative of the Italian government had told his errand, Pius IX. looked long in silence through the window over the Piazza di S. Pietro. Then he turned round, held his hand before his brimming eyes, and exclaimed: "Yes—if only there had been no *legge Siccardi*!" After all, the Sardinian church policy was one of the greatest hindrances to a reconciliation between the kingdom of Italy and the Papacy.

But Victor Emmanuel continued to hope that he would win Rome as he had won Venice. At the end of January, 1868, he expressed to Massari, who had just returned from a visit to Rome, his firm hope that the Italians would obtain the papal city. If Italy were again involved in a war, it would, he thought, be absolutely necessary first to solve the Roman question. But, for the moment, there was no prospect of a solution of the question, and, at the close of the year 1869, Victor Emmanuel, who was then staying at San Rossore, was taken so ill that he expected to die. He hastily had his marriage with the Countess di Mirafiori blessed by the Church, and he also called for a priest in order that he might receive absolution. The priest drew a paper from his pocket, and asked the dying King to sign it; it was a revocation of all the steps which during his reign he had presumed to take in reference to the Church. Victor Emmanuel had still sufficient mental power and clearness to draw the priest's attention to the fact that it was impossible for him, as a constitutional king, to sign such a political document without the knowledge of his responsible ministers, and he commanded the priest to go into the adjoining chamber, where Menabrea was in waiting. The poor clergyman obeyed, but excused himself to the Prime Minister, by saying that he was acting under the injunction of the Archbishop of Pisa, Cardinal Corsi. Menabrea told him to give the King absolution without delay, and threatened

to arrest him if he dared to refuse.¹ The priest then obeyed, and afterwards Pius IX. sent his blessing and forgiveness by telegraph.²

Victor Emmanuel did not die that time; but, as the *Civiltà Cattolica* says, he rewarded the great goodness and clemency of Pius IX. by crowning the work of revolution in entering Rome and setting up his throne in the Quirinal.

The obstinate refusal of France to give up intervention produced great coolness between the Court of Florence and the Tuileries, but at the same time a *rapprochement* took place between Italy and Austria. After defeat on the battlefield, the empire had dropped the ultramontane banner, and on 21st December 1867 the Emperor Francis Joseph, "with a heavy heart,"³ signed the new constitution, which secured to his subjects religious liberty and the freedom of the Press. Cardinal Rauscher appealed to all Roman Catholics in Austria to work by all lawful means for a better state of things, to prevent the schools from becoming places for the unchristianising of the young, the Press from obtaining the right of inveighing shamelessly against everything that was high and holy, and boys of fourteen years of age who wished to escape an examination in religion from declaring themselves not to belong to any denomination.⁴ The protest of Rauscher and of the rest of the bishops was ineffectual; and naturally it availed nothing that Pius IX., in a solemn allocution, called the new Austrian constitution "abominable." Von Beust pointed out to Antonelli that the Papacy in its ingratitude overlooked the fact that the bishops of the empire could still discuss matters freely with Rome, and treat independently with their priests, and that the Church kept its property intact. The Austrian government proposed new legislation concerning civil marriage and state superintendence of the schools, without any regard to the displeasure of the bishops. Rauscher in vain endeavoured to prove that the new laws were a breach of all agreements with Rome, and a blot on Austria's bright scutcheon; but on 21st March 1868 the Upper House passed them in spite of his protest.⁵

¹ Massari, 408.

² *Civiltà Cattolica* for 17th August 1889, 414f.

³ Von Beust: *Aus drei Viertel Jahrhunderten* II, 161f.

⁴ Wolfgruber: *Card. Rauscher*, 515f.

⁵ Wolfgruber, 199f.

The Concordat thus received a fatal blow ; and before the final vote in the Upper House, the Austrian ambassador at Rome, Count Crivelli, had already been ordered to open a negotiation with the Vatican as to an extensive change in the Concordat. Pius IX. did not seem quite unwilling to agree to such a change. He remarked jestingly to Count Crivelli : "The Concordat is like a lady's dress ; it might be let out or taken in, but it ought not to be taken off."¹ But when it came to the point, Rome would not give way to Austrian Liberalism, and the bishops and priests continued to agitate for the maintenance of the Concordat, and for the repeal of the new laws.

South German Ultramontanism observed with indignation that Josephinism, which was believed to have been vanquished by the Concordat of 1855, was rising with new vigour in the Roman Catholic empire ; and it would have been glad to widen the gulf between the South German states and Prussia in order to stay the Protestant power of the North in its victorious path. At the same time French Ultramontanism, headed by the Empress Eugénie, was inciting Napoleon III. to a war with Prussia. The war came, but the South Germans fought by the side of the Prussians, and Napoleon III. succumbed in the struggle. With the fall of the French empire the September Convention came to an end, and Italy obtained a free hand with regard to Rome.

¹ Von Beust II, 183.

CHAPTER XX

THE VATICAN COUNCIL

IT is not easy to say when Pius IX. first conceived the idea of calling together a General Council. In 1846 he is reported to have already spoken of such a thing.¹ Certain it is, that on 6th December 1864—two days before the issue of the encyclical *Quanta cura*—after the usual discussions were ended, he confided to the members of the Congregation of Rites, in the greatest secrecy (*sotto rigoroso segreto*), that for a long time (*da lungo tempo*) he had been thinking of meeting the great need of the Church by resorting to the unusual measure of holding an ecumenical council.² In the course of two months twenty-one of the cardinals who formed the Congregation of Rites sent in writing their opinions regarding this important project. Only two of the twenty-one considered it unnecessary, the one because councils presumably ought only to be convoked when the faith was in imminent danger; the other because he thought that the subjects which were to be treated at such a council were of too delicate a nature, and because the outward means required for the council were wanting. The nineteen who affirmed the necessity did not agree that it was absolute; some of them thought that a council could only be said to be relatively necessary. As to subjects which ought to be laid before the assembly, the cardinals suggested the condemnation of the errors of modern times, various disciplinary questions, the freedom of the Press, civil marriage, and so

¹ J. Friedrich: *Tagebuch. Während des Vat. Concils geführt* (Nördlingen 1871), 294.

² *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1013. Manning: *The true story of the Vatican Council* (London 1877), 4f. [Dr Nielsen regrets that he had not access to Cecconi's *Storia del Concilio ecumenico Vaticano* (Roma 1872).]

forth. Only two mentioned the Infallibility of the Pope, but one or two suggested that the question whether the Pope's temporal power is a necessity should also be discussed.

At the beginning of January, 1865, Pius IX. mentioned the matter to Plantier, the highly-trusted Bishop of Nîmes,¹ perhaps also to others; and in March a commission was appointed, consisting of the Cardinals Patrizi, Reisach, Panebianco, Bizzarri, and Caterini, with the Archbishop of Sardis, afterwards Cardinal Giannelli, as secretary.² The commission was to discuss the necessity of the council, possible hindrances in the way of its meeting, its relation to the sovereigns, and so on. On 10th April enquiries were confidentially sent out to thirty-five bishops with regard to the contemplated council, amongst others to Archbishop Guibert of Tours, and to Bishop Dupanloup. The first considered that a Roman Council would be a "new occupation of Rome in the name of Catholicity," and would serve to maintain the moral necessity of the Pope's temporal power;³ the second, on the contrary, felt difficulties.⁴ On 17th November similar enquiries were at length sent to the nuncios at Paris, Vienna, Madrid, Munich, and Brussels;⁵ Rome wished by all means to be sure that the scheme would find general support.

When the bishops were assembled at Rome in June 1867 for the eighteenth centenary of St Peter, Pius IX., as has been said before,⁶ mentioned in his allocution the great project he had in his mind, and it was received with enthusiasm;⁷ he had also the satisfaction of finding that Dupanloup had now changed his views. The assembled bishops, in answer to the allocution, composed an address in which some wished the word "infallible" inserted in reference to the Pope's office and authority, because they did not like to return to their dioceses without having done something for the Infallibility.⁸

¹ Maynard : *Mgr. Dupanloup* III, 155.

² *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1014. Giannelli was secretary of the congregation which decided all questions referring to the Council of Trent.

³ J. Paguette de Follenay : *Vie du Card. Guibert* II, 419.

⁴ Maynard, 156.

⁵ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1024.

⁶ See above, p. 282.

⁷ *Collectio Lacensis*, 1029f. About the scheme of the Council it says: "jamdiu enim animo agitavimus."

⁸ Manning, 53f. Acton : *Zur Geschichte des Vat. Concils*, 13f.

This, however, was warded off; the bishops contented themselves with saying that they were convinced that "Peter had spoken through the mouth of Pius," and with quoting the decree of the Florentine Council, in which the Pope is called the Vicar of Christ, the Head of the whole Church, the Father and Teacher of all Christians.¹ Pius IX. answered them by announcing that the meeting should be opened on some feast of the *Conceptio immaculata*.²

As soon as the festival of the centenary was ended, Dupanloup hastened home in order to be the first to announce the great news, and there were many of the admirers of the Bishop of Orléans who, to the annoyance of his antagonist Mgr. Pie, thought that he, who in truth had at first been an opponent of the idea, was really the author of the proud scheme which was attracting such attention.³ When his friends shortly afterwards assembled at a congress at Malines, Count de Falloux delivered a speech amidst great applause, in which he represented the Pope's scheme, as though Pius IX. meant to say to the nineteenth century: "Many mouths are closed, many voices stifled; but I will open the mouth of the Universal Church. Minds are tormented by doubt, hearts are afflicted by pain; well, then, I who am called an enemy of discussion, I will inaugurate the most comprehensive, the freest discussion concerning the most important interests of all mankind."⁴

But the enthusiasm was not everywhere equally great. Cardinal Manning relates that the Austrian ambassador at Rome, Baron Hübner, was anything but pleased with the Pope's design, because he feared that the council would disclose the want of unity between the bishops, and weaken the authority of the Church.⁵ And within a short time even Count de Falloux and his friends took a far less optimistic view of the coming meeting and its freedom of speech.

Men asked quite naturally what was the real aim of this "unusual measure," and people's thoughts were then immediately directed to two points: the turning of the Syllabus into

¹ The address of 1st July 1867 in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1033f.

² His answer in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1042f.

³ Maynard, 156.

⁴ Falloux: *Mémoires d'un royaliste* II, 413f.

⁵ Purcell: *Manning* II, 457.

dogma, which had so often been spoken of, and the definition of the dogma of the Pope's Infallibility, which, as Dechamps, afterwards Archbishop of Malines, said, "was in the air and demanded a decision." Pius IX., in his youth, had been under the influence of the visionary Anna Maria Taigi (died 1837), who had predicted not only his elevation to the see of St Peter, but also his afflictions, and the great triumph he was to prepare for the Church.¹ One victory he had already prepared for her: the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. But this demanded as its supplement the dogma of Infallibility. When Mgr. Ségur returned from Lourdes in 1870, he wrote to Mgr. Pie: "Pius IX. has said to Mary: 'Thou art immaculate.' Mary will surely answer him: 'Thou art infallible.'" ² Many thought thus. While Pius IX. was occupied with the publication of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, he said to a Dominican, who objected that the new dogma presupposed a proclamation of the Pope's Infallibility: "That will come too."³ It was indeed officially asserted that Pius IX. did not care very much to have the infallibility "defined," because nobody made any objection to it.⁴ But the Jesuits made every effort to procure the definition of this dogma, which, according to their theory of the history of doctrine, had long ago passed from the period of implicit belief into the time of testing, and now required to be decisively defined.

At the festival of the centenary in 1867, on St Peter's and St Paul's Day, Manning and Bishop Senestrey of Regensburg took a vow which was drawn up by the Jesuit Padre Liberatore. According to its terms they would do everything in their power to call forth a definition of the papal infallibility; they were to offer up stated prayers for it every day.⁵ And the two prelates kept their vow. Manning in particular agitated early and late for the Infallibility. Shortly after the centenary festival Pius IX. received two addresses from England, one from the Chapter

¹ Callisto: *Vita della V. S. di Dio A. M. Taigi* (Roma 1889), 206f.

² Baunard: *Le Card. Pie* II, 401.

³ Friedrich: *Tagebuch*, 294. As early as 1852 a Jesuit preached at Rome on the infallibility as a "fatto" according to the Lord's word, as a "diritto" on account of the Church's need of it. K. Steffensen: *Ges. Aufsätze* (Basel 1890), 88.

⁴ Acton, 7.

⁵ Purcell: *Manning* II, 420.

at Westminster, and one from the Fathers of the Oratory in London, both of which contained petitions for the definition of Infallibility; and in Manning's and Senestrey's circles it was said that Infallibility ought to be immediately proclaimed by acclamation. Mgr. Plantier, of Nîmes, who had indeed been one of the initiated, declared in a pastoral letter of 26th March 1869, that a preliminary discussion was totally superfluous in this matter; it would not be more difficult for the Holy Ghost to preserve the Church from errors in the fire of acclamation than in the arguments of a debate.¹ Against this Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, made an immediate protest in the name of commonsense and of history, and people's minds began to be divided. The time before the Council was used for the skirmishes of outposts and for a preliminary trial of strength between the forces for and against Infallibility. It rained pastoral letters, pamphlets, and articles on the great question.

Bishop Dupanloup and his friends were waiting in the greatest suspense for the papal Bull that should summon the council; they were apprehensive lest its form should be of the nature of a challenge. None of them denied Infallibility themselves; they were only, as Montalembert expressed it, afraid of the abuse of the Infallibility, which minds without tact and responsibility might allow themselves to make.² At the beginning of 1868 Dupanloup ventured to write to Pius IX. to ask him to issue as soon as possible the Bull of invitation, which was so much longed for; and, as this letter was graciously received at Rome, he became bolder. On 16th March he sent the Pope a longer letter, the meaning of which was shortly, that the authorities at Rome ought to be most careful that the Bull should offend nobody.³

On 28th June 1868, the long expected Bull appeared, which summoned the Council to meet on 8th December 1869;⁴ it was a counterpart of the invitation of Paul III. to the Council of Trent, only somewhat more diffuse. While referring to the unhappy circumstances of the time, Pius IX. declares: "At this General Council there will be a careful examination and

¹ Maynard, 177.

² Falloux II, 415.

³ The letter in Lagrange: *Dupanloup* III, 79f.

⁴ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1f., and Friedberg, 228f.

determination of everything that concerns the glory of God, the purity of the faith, the dignity of Divine service, the everlasting salvation of men, discipline, a profitable and thorough education of the priesthood, obedience to the laws of the Church, the promotion of morality, the Christian teaching of the young, peace, and above everything unity." Letters were afterwards issued, which invited the Orthodox Greek bishops together with the Protestants and other Non-Catholics;¹ a similar invitation to the Protestants had been put forth at the time of the Council of Trent. The Abate Testa on 5th (17th) October had an interview with the Patriarch of Constantinople, but the Patriarch, who knew already from the newspapers of the invitation of the Bishop of "Old Rome," declared that he would not be present nor cause fresh pain by opening old wounds.² The other Eastern patriarchs sent similar refusals, nor did the Protestants feel inclined to act on the Pope's invitation "to return quickly to Christ's only fold." The consistory of Berlin answered by publishing a circular appealing for collections on behalf of the Gustavus Adolphus Society, which supports Evangelical churches in Roman Catholic lands.³ The theologians of Groeningen, the Evangelical Alliance, and the Reformed ministers of Geneva published answers, in which they declared that they would be unable to take part in the Council; and certain Protestant clergymen advised the Roman Church to do away with the celibacy of the clergy, and to introduce communion in both kinds.⁴ A Scotch Presbyterian, Dr Cumming, applied to Manning to learn the conditions on which Protestants might take part. Manning forwarded the enquiry to Rome, and from thence the answer came that Protestants must return to the father's house as prodigal sons. Afterwards, Pius IX. informed Manning that there would be some theologians at Rome ready to debate with the Protestants with a view to converting them, but at the Council itself their cause could not be dealt with; it was decided long ago, and their sentence pronounced.⁵ Some Christian Jews, who

¹ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1f.

² Friedberg, 250f.

³ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1123f. Friedberg, 253f.

⁴ Their letter to Bishop Martin of Paderborn in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1137f.

⁵ The letters in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 114f., and in Friedberg, 255f.

wished that Israel also should be invited, received the intimation that the real vintage of Israel was not yet at hand; but the Pope was hoping to gather single grapes.¹

In some places there was surprise that Pius IX. had not followed the example of Paul III. in inviting the Roman Catholic sovereigns to send ambassadors (*Oratores*) to the Council. It had been contemplated but had been given up, because several of the Roman Catholic sovereigns had broken the Concordats made with Rome, so that according to Ultramontane ideas they no longer represented Catholic kingdoms, but states that had no religion. The omission to invite the sovereigns, however, attracted painful attention, especially in France. Immediately before the issue of the Bull of invitation Antonelli had said to the French ambassador at Rome that the princes would not be kept away, but that on account of the excommunicated Victor Emmanuel the Vatican, in the Bull itself, had been content to make a general appeal to them.² Montalembert, De Broglie, Auguste Cochin, De Falloux, the English Catholic Lord Emly (Mr Monsell), and a Liberal Spanish bishop were assembled at Orléans with Dupanloup, and they agreed to write an article on the subject in the *Correspondant*. Dupanloup meanwhile laid before his friends a whole series of letters from eminent prelates in France and elsewhere, which further opened their eyes to the difficulties of the situation.³ Emile Ollivier had declared in the Chamber of Deputies that the exclusion of the sovereigns from the Council was tantamount to the Pope's introducing with his own hand a separation between State and Church;⁴ and the *Univers* on behalf of Ultramontanism had asserted that the exclusion of the princes proved (*constatait*) that they were now "outside the Church." The State, in the opinion of the Ultramontane paper, had become "a chaos and a sink," and all Catholics in fact stood outside it. The question was no longer therefore one of alliances, but of conquests, to prepare the way for a confederation of the nations under the

¹ Friedberg, 65f.

² Lagrange: *Dupanloup* III, 83f. Cp. the despatches in Ollivier; *L'église et l'état au Concile du Vatican* II, 55f.

³ Falloux II, 418f.

⁴ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1216f.

guidance of the Pope; the democracy which was in process of formation was to do what monarchy had not been able or willing to do.

Such language greatly displeased Dupanloup, who was closely connected with the Tuileries. In order to get to know what was felt outside France, he undertook a journey to Malines, where he met the new Archbishop, Mgr. Dechamps, and Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz; he also went to Aix-la-Chapelle, and to Cologne. After his return, he wrote a pastoral letter on the subject of the Council, in which he expressed his hope that all misunderstandings between the Church and Christian nations would cease, and that the Church would succeed in keeping evangelical principles free from all frauds and corruptions. This pastoral letter caused fresh irritation in the ultramontane camp; it was described as an attempt to bring about a reconciliation between the truth and error. But from England, Germany, Poland, Spain, and America came expressions of thanks to the Bishop of Orléans.

During these conflicts, large and small, between the Ultramontane and the Liberal sections of the episcopate, Rome was busy preparing for the forthcoming Council. Famous native and foreign theologians were summoned to put their learning and acumen at the service of the Church; but in the choice, and in the use of those chosen, more regard was generally paid to the attitude of the persons in question towards the doctrine of Infallibility and towards Ultramontanism than to their scientific ability.¹ It seems as if it had been intended to invite Newman among others, but by certain clever manœuvres Manning and the Jesuits succeeded in evading this unpleasant selection. A couple of insignificant Englishmen were chosen in his place, and the most eminent of English Roman Catholics was not present. Afterwards, when Dupanloup wished to take him with him as his theologian, Newman refused the invitation. He would not go to the Council in the retinue of a French bishop.²

The councillors who were summoned were divided into a managing congregation (*congregazione direttrice*) and six com-

¹ Quirinus: *Letters from Rome on the Council* (Eng. Tr., London 1870), 8.

² Purcell II, 422f.

missions. The president of the managing congregation was Cardinal Patrizi; the members of it included the Cardinals Reisach, Barnabò, Panebianco, Bizzarri, Bilio, Caterini, Capalti, and De Luca, the Jesuit Sanguinetti, professor of Church History at the *Collegium Romanum*, and Cardinal Manning's mouth-piece at the Vatican,¹ Mgr. Talbot, younger son of Lord Talbot de Malahide. Afterwards, Cardinal Schwarzenberg succeeded in procuring that the historian of the Councils, Professor Hefele of Tübingen, who on 19th June 1869 had been appointed Bishop of Rottenburg in Württemberg, should also be summoned to Rome, and a place on the managing committee was assigned to him.² Into the important dogmatic commission Pius IX. admitted, first and foremost, Perrone, the Jesuit teacher of dogmatic theology, who was then very aged, but still in full vigour both of body and mind;³ to the same commission Loyola's order supplied also two other eminent teachers of dogmatics, Franzelin and Schrader. Those friends of the Jesuits, the apologist Hettinger of Würzburg and Gay of Poitiers, were also members of it; likewise the Dominicans Spada, Tosa, and Giacinto de' Ferrari, the Minorite Adragna, the Augustinian Martinelli, Leo XIII.'s brother Giuseppe Pecci, then professor of philosophy at the University of Rome; the church historian Alzog of Freiburg, and for a short while Monaco La Valletta, afterwards Cardinal. The favourite of Pius IX. and of the Jesuits, the Barnabite Luigi Bilio, who shortly before had received a cardinal's hat, presided over this commission.

All the councillors had to take an oath, that they would observe the deepest secrecy; the least breach of it would immediately result in excommunication.⁴ The subjects for discussion and the form of procedure in the several commissions were arranged by the managing congregation. As a rule each of the councillors had to give a report on a fixed subject, and sometimes there were more reporters than one. The reporter in the dogmatic commission had first to explain all errors as regards the doctrinal points in question, mention-

¹ Purcell II, 86f. ; many of his letters are in the book.

² Friedberg, 64f.

³ Fr. Hettinger: *Aus Welt und Kirche* I, 106f.

⁴ Quirinus, 13.

ing the most important representatives and centres of the heresies. He was then to examine the historical development of the heresies, and especially to trace whether they had formerly been condemned by the Church. He was afterwards to present them in a formula, which would show shortly and clearly their opposition to the Catholic doctrine, and to give reasons for their condemnation. Lastly, he was to put forward the Catholic view, proved by Holy Scripture and tradition, and to formulate certain canons, by which the heresies could be judged. When the reporter had finished his task, the other councillors began their work of examining the draft, and thus the "scheme" was prepared, which was to be laid before the Council. It was first put into good style by a standing literary committee, usually aided by the reporter himself.¹ Contrary to custom, the bishops were kept away from the preparatory work of the Council. But certain questions were laid before them, through Cardinal Caterini, about various matters of no great importance. They were asked, for instance, how far heretics and schismatics in their dioceses were excluded from acting as sponsors; as to the means of preventing the misfortunes resulting from civil marriage, and as to the manner in which young priests might best be led to continue their studies, and about irregularities in the use of churchyards.²

These questions to the bishops might seem to indicate that matters of discipline were to be the chief subjects treated of at the forthcoming Council; but nobody really believed that such extensive machinery would be set in motion for such trifling topics. Everywhere people were looking for some hints of what was going to happen. It attracted, therefore, great attention, when, in the *Civiltà Cattolica* for 6th February 1869, in a letter from France,³ printed under the heading: *Cose spettante al futuro concilio*, the wish was expressed that the doctrine of the Syllabus might be solemnly confirmed, the Papal Infallibility defined by acclamation,⁴ as an indirect rejection of the famous Gallican articles of 1682, and the dogma

¹ Hettinger I, 443f.

² *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1027. Friedberg, 224f.

³ *Civiltà Cattolica*, Ser. vii, Vol. V, 351f.

⁴ "Ma si spera che la manifestazione unanime dello Spirito Santo per la bocca dei Padri del futuro concilio ecumenico la definirà per acclamazione."

of the Blessed Virgin's bodily ascension announced (*gloriosa Assunzione*). The Jesuit organ was in such close connexion with the Vatican that the article was bound to be understood as a *ballon d'essai*. Antonelli, however, immediately repudiated every shadow of responsibility for this utterance, which seemed to turn the bishops into mere blind followers,¹ and Pius IX. declared to the ambassadors of the foreign powers that the *Civiltà* was by no means the organ of St Peter's see. "I also," he said jestingly to the French envoy, "have my share of the liberty of the Press, and from what I know of it, I understand full well what difficulties it can cause elsewhere. Some time ago I sent for Padre Piccirillo, and asked him if he thought that he served the Church by such announcements. But those people follow only their own ideas."²

But in spite of the Pope's and of Antonelli's words, both friends and enemies thought that the article in the *Civiltà* expressed the secret hope of the Vatican. Dupanloup was alarmed when he read it, and he immediately had a couple of articles published in his organ, the *Français*, which were intended to pacify people's minds. They won approval in many places, even at Rome. Rumour there had it that the Pope was displeased, and even Conservative cardinals considered that the Jesuits had been guilty of a tactical mistake in publishing the article.³ But it went its way through all countries, and it was commented upon from all sides. On 10th to 15th March the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* published Döllinger's famous articles, *Das Concilium und die Civiltà*, which attempted to make it clear to everybody what it would mean if the Pope's Infallibility became an article of faith, and the propositions in the Syllabus were made dogmas. He predicted that a great and far-reaching diminution of religious faith among Catholic peoples would be the first and lasting effect of the intended "Council of flattery."⁴ In the month of April the *Civiltà* published a new article,⁵ which asserted that the

¹ Friedrich, in spite of the Cardinal's denial, calls the article, in the preface to Döllinger *Das Papstthum* VII., "die von Cardinal Antonelli durch den Nuntius Chigi in Paris bestellte und den Jesuiten übergebene Correspondenz über das Concil."

² E. Ollivier : *L'église et l'état au Concile du Vatican* I, 437.

³ The letter from Rome of 4th April 1869 in Lagrange III, 100f.

⁴ *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* 1869, No. 74, 1126.

⁵ Ser. vii, Vol. VI, 193f.

much discussed letter was really written in France—which the *Français* had doubted—it could therefore neither betray the secret plans of the Council, nor be an expression of the editor's opinion. To this were added some supercilious remarks about the curious *ignoranza* of the people who were offended because a definition by acclamation had been mentioned; this method of procedure, the editors asserted, was by no means a new thing in the history of the Councils. That same periodical afterwards published several articles, which spoke with great bitterness of the highly objectionable school of Regalists, Febronians, Liberals, and Freemasons, who had their home at Munich, and who had chosen the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* as their organ.

Prince Hohenlohe, then Bavarian Foreign Minister, afterwards German Chancellor, believed that the moment had arrived for the governments to intervene. Haneberg, the Abbot of St Bonifaz, near Munich, had returned home,¹ and had related that Archbishop Manning, according to report, had undertaken to call forth the acclamation of the dogma of Infallibility.² The Prince thought, therefore, that the *Civiltà* had really been well informed, and on 9th April 1869 he issued to the Bavarian envoys a circular despatch,³ requesting them to call the attention of the respective governments to the forthcoming Council, and suggested united action, so that the Holy See might not be uncertain of the attitude which the governments would take towards the Council. Afterwards the President of the Swiss Federal Council sent an enquiry to the Prussian minister at Berne with regard to the intentions of Prussia. The question, therefore, was now brought before the tribunal of the diplomatists from more than one side.

Bismarck informed the Swiss president that Prussia shared neither the great hopes nor the anxieties with which the Council was regarded in other quarters. "We believe that for a hierarchical tendency," thus he wrote to the ambassador at Berne, in order that the latter might pass it on, "a remedy will be found in a natural reaction within the Catholic world. We look, therefore, upon the meeting of the Council without

¹ 12th March; Schegg: *Erinnerungen an Dr D. B. von Haneberg* (Munich 1877), 199.

² Friedrich I, 755.

³ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1199f.

any disquietude whatever; its deliberations will only in a small degree touch our political interests.”¹ Count Arnim, the Prussian ambassador at Rome, treated Prince Hohenlohe’s proposal with still greater contempt. He considered that the Bavarian minister was “inspired” by Döllinger, “whose theological tendencies Rome had suppressed at the instance of ultramontane German Science,” and he insinuated that Döllinger was personally hurt because he had not been invited to take part in the labours preparatory to the Council. According to Count Arnim, the decision of the question of Infallibility would in any case be without essential influence upon the State, and it would be very regrettable if the State were to interfere in a theological school debate. There might be occasion for uneasiness with respect to the resolutions which the church-politics commission was engaged in preparing; but since they were unknown no protest could be made against them. The government could, however, object to binding rules being made by Rome for the relation of the State to the Church without asking the advice of the State. It should therefore be demanded that one or more representatives of Germany should be admitted to the deliberations of the Council. But the Count found it best that the negotiations with Bavaria should for the present be kept secret, until it had been seen what line would be taken by France, which was much more directly interested.²

In a despatch of 26th May Bismarck absolutely rejected Count Arnim’s plan of sending *oratores* to the Council. Rome would most probably refuse a heretical state like Prussia admission to the Council, and Prussian *oratores*, even if they themselves were Catholics, would hold an awkward position towards the rest of the members of the Council, because representing a Protestant state. Their vote would be of no importance as against the great Ultramontane majority, and, of course, they would not be allowed to record a veto in the name of their government. “To protest is always a thankless task, and it avails only when he who protests has the power to hinder what he protests against.” And as a further reason, the relation of the Church to the State was now quite different

¹ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1202f.

² The despatch of 14th May 1869 in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1203f.

from what it was in old times, at any rate in those countries which, like Prussia, had not acknowledged the decisions of the Council of Trent. There was for Prussia, therefore, in Bismarck's opinion, on account both of its constitution and of its political laws, but one position which it could take up, namely, to allow the Church full liberty in ecclesiastical matters, but to ward off with the greatest firmness any encroachment on the Church's part. The despatch of *oratores* would only be reasonable if a fusion of State and Church were agreed upon, a thing to which the Prussian government would never lend a helping hand.¹

Prince Hohenlohe's proposal was thus to all intents and purposes shelved. Individual German states, like Baden and Saxe-Weimar, did indeed make known their inclination to interpose by diplomatic representation; but, without Prussia, nothing could be done in that direction on the part of Germany, nor did the proposal meet with sympathy outside of Prussia. In Austria Prince Hohenlohe's despatch was looked upon as "a Liberal rocket," and Count von Beust, who directed the foreign policy of Austria, in a despatch of 15th May 1869, took up a similar position to that of Prussia. Austria, which on principle allowed to the religious bodies which it recognised full liberty in their internal concerns, so long as there was no collision with the State, hoped that the Catholic bishops who travelled to Rome would take with them "an accurate knowledge of the practical needs of our time." If the Council's work were made in advance the object of a diplomatic conference, it would, Count Beust thought, look like an invasion of the liberty of the Roman Church. But if the Council should be guilty of making encroachments, Austria would gladly join in united action.²

From France also there came a refusal. On 9th April—the same day as Prince Hohenlohe's circular was sent out—Emile Ollivier had put a question to the government about its attitude towards the Council, and had asked whether the bishops might freely go to Rome and act at the Council with full liberty, and whether the government would be represented

¹ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1206f.

² The despatch and Count von Beust's defence of it in his *Aus drei Viertel-Jahrhunderten* II, 278f.

by legates and ambassadors.¹ The first two questions were answered decidedly in the affirmative by the Minister of Public Worship; for the government had full confidence both in the wisdom of the French bishops and in their patriotic feelings. To the last question, on the other hand, the minister could not at present give an answer. Every one knew that it would be difficult to induce the Emperor to consent to a step which was displeasing to the clerical party, and therefore Prince Hohenlohe's proposal was politely declined by France. Belgium, Holland, England, and Spain declared likewise, though for different reasons, against any idea of mixing themselves up with the work of the Council. Even Italy refused. Minghetti, who had entered the government shortly before, induced it to range itself on the side of religious freedom, and to show its Liberal views by a policy of reserve towards the Council.² But in a circular despatch of 30th April 1869 the Italian government expressed its wish for a solemn and united declaration of the rights of the State in relation to the Church. This wish, however, met with no greater favour than the suggestion of Prince Hohenlohe.

Outside diplomatic circles the matter was not taken with such exalted tranquillity; and in the Rhine provinces, in particular, people's minds were much disturbed. When Bishop von Ketteler, in May 1869, during a confirmation tour, stayed the night with the priest at Oberolm (in Rhenish Hesse), he told his host that the Jesuits would make an attempt to have the doctrines of the Pope's Infallibility, of his universal episcopate, and his absolute authority over clergy and laity, and of his temporal power, erected into dogmas. "If that happens," said the anxious bishop, "it will do great harm, especially in Germany, and will surely lead to a schism."³ These sayings spread abroad, and laymen in many places began to move, in order to ward off the threatening danger. A beginning was made at Coblenz, where a "laymen's address" to the Bishop of Trier and the Archbishop of Cologne was adopted on 18th May. The first draft was made by a headmaster at the public school

¹ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 123of.

² Acton, 28f. Cp. Friedrich, 22f.

³ Friedrich II, 35f., according to a letter from Dr Kilp, to whom the priest had communicated the bishop's words the next day.

of Coblenz, but it was corrected by three professors at Bonn—Cornelius, Kampschulte, and Reusch.¹ In this address objection was taken to the assertion of the Ultramontanes that they were the only “true” Catholics, and the laymen requested the two prelates to abandon all desire for a revival of the theocracy of the Middle Ages, and to work instead for the restoration of regular national, provincial, and diocesan synods—for the bringing about of a more perfect harmony between State and Church, and for better relations with the Protestants.² The Archbishop of Cologne gave a very cold answer, which ended with an expression of the hope that the laymen would accept the decisions of the Council as utterances of the Holy Ghost, whether they were in accordance with their wishes or not; and the papal nuncio at Munich, Meglia, was highly displeased with the Coblenz address, which, in his opinion, contained *il vero programma del Germanismo*—the fundamental ideas of German theology, so detested by the Jesuits.³ But at other places the laymen’s address called forth great enthusiasm. Montalembert expressed his delight in a letter to Coblenz, and called it a splendid expression of the conscientiousness and good sense of Catholics. He rejoiced in its manly and Christian language, which formed a praiseworthy contrast to the declamations and flatteries that were heard from other quarters.⁴

The Coblenz address awakened also the desire of imitation. The Tariff Parliament assembled at Berlin in June, and on the 17th of that month twenty-two of the Roman Catholic members of it met in a “laymen’s council” in the Kurstrasse in the great hall of the “Red Eagle.”⁵ The chair was taken by Peter Reichensperger, councillor of the supreme tribunal, and a row of Catholic notabilities sat at the long table—the Hanoverian minister, Von Windthorst, Von Mitnacht from Württemberg, Privy Councillor von Savigny, Count Hompesch, Jörg, the editor of the *Historisch-politische Blätter*, and several other

¹ *Erinnerungen an Amalia von Lasaulx* (Gotha 1878), 249.

² The address in Friedberg, 268f.

³ Friedrich II, 42.

⁴ *Erinnerungen an Amalia von Lasaulx*, 250.

⁵ Sepp: *Deutschland und der Vatikan* (München 1878), p. 1f. Sepp was himself present.

"earnest Catholics." An address was agreed to,¹ which was to remind the German bishops that a council had never been summoned in order to create something new, but only to testify to that which the Church had at all times and everywhere believed. There were also bold words about the rights of the laity to have a voice in the matter, because they also transmit tradition. But before this "draft" became an address, the advice of an authority was taken—probably that of the papal nuncio at Munich—as to whether such a step would be opportune or not. The authority, of course, considered that it was anything but opportune, and the Berlin address was therefore never presented. But when it was rumoured that some of the German bishops would attach great importance to such an expression from good Catholics, the "draft" was lithographed and distributed among the members, so that some of these might give it to the German bishops before their departure for Rome, and might promise them the support of the laity. Professor Sepp, of Munich, was entrusted with the delivery of the opinions of the Berlin Council to Cardinal Schwarzenberg. The Bohemian prelate read the document slowly through, and then remarked: "This is far too mild; quite a different language must be used to Rome."² But Meglia declared that there were not a few *errori espressivi* in the opinions of the twenty-two earnest Catholics.³

As Prince Hohenlohe's plan for common diplomatic intervention had stranded, a new plan made its appearance. It was proposed to send one or two eminent personages to Rome, who should give the Vatican good advice, and a serious warning against trusting "the experienced helmsmen" too completely. It was for a moment the disposition in some quarters to entrust King John of Saxony, who had proved, as the translator of Dante, that he was quite at home in scholastic theology, with the difficult task of bringing the Vatican to reason. In order to secure the necessary theological and legal basis for such a princely intervention, Hohenlohe submitted various questions to the theologians and jurists of the University of Munich; as to the probable effects of making dogma of the Syllabus, and

¹ Friedberg: *Aktenstücke die altkatholische Bewegung betreffend* (Tübingen 1876) 43f. and 273f.

² Sepp, 4.

³ Friedrich II, 52.

of defining the Papal Infallibility; upon the relations between Church and State; as to the significance of such dogmas for the public teachers of Christian doctrine and of canon law; as to the criteria for deciding how far a papal pronouncement is *ex cathedra* or not; and as to the influence of the proposed dogmas upon elementary education and the catechisms. The theological faculty was divided into an anti-Jesuit majority, and an ultramontane minority;¹ the faculty of law only answered the first question, and only from "the standpoint of the Bavarian State."² But one of the Munich lawyers, Doctor von Bayer, gave a separate opinion, which ended with the declaration that the author considered it "perfectly incredible" that the Fathers of the Council could give their consent to the carrying out of the *Civiltà's* desires; for serious difficulties would thereby be created for the Church in at least a large part of the Catholic world.³ These academical opinions were not suited to be instructions for a princely representative, and the scheme for choosing such a representative was quickly discarded.

But the unrest in people's minds had not subsided; and indignation at the high-flown projects of the Jesuits rose still higher in connexion with the recasting of the articles from the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* on the Council and the *Civiltà*, which was published on 31st July, under the pseudonym of "Janus." This work, which was due to Döllinger and his colleague, Professor Johann Huber,⁴ was intended to supply a historical guide to understanding the significance of the questions which, according to trustworthy accounts, were to be set before the forthcoming Council; and it contained a crushing historical criticism of Papal Infallibility. The Roman *Accademia di Religione Cattolica* was entrusted with the task of refuting the arguments of the learned German historian; but the Roman academicians did not get beyond a few "impotent sophisms."⁵ On the other hand, Professor Hergenröther, of Würzburg, one of the strongholds of German Ultramontanism,

¹ The two *vota* in Friedberg, 298f. and 303f.

² Friedberg, 313f.

³ *Ibid.*, 323f.

⁴ Cp. E. Zirngiebl: *Joh. Huber* (Gotha 1881), 150f. and the preface to 2nd ed. of *Janus: Das Papstthum* (München 1892).

⁵ According to the letter of a Roman Dominican to Döllinger, see his *Papstthum*, p. iv. Cp. Friedrich II, 87f.

came forward with an *Anti-Janus*, which was praised by the Ultramontanes as an annihilation of the tissue of lies, which were to be found in the Munich professor's book, and which, in the opinion of Bishop Ketteler, had only one parallel for untruthfulness — Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales*.¹ On 26th November the Congregation of the Index condemned *Janus*; and on 2nd December placards were seen on the usual church doors of Rome, announcing that Pius IX., on 30th November, had confirmed the condemnation. But the friends of *Janus* — *Le Janagel* (or tag-rag), as the *Revue des Deux Mondes* afterwards stooped to call them — did not rest quiet. Professor Huber in April 1870 came forward with a little pamphlet called *Das Papstthum und der Staat*, directed against Professor Hergenröther, and it was followed by several similar "Voices from the Catholic Church on the church questions of the moment" (*Stimmen aus der katholischen Kirche über die Kirchenfragen der Gegenwart*.)

The literary agitation for and against Infallibility, after the article of February in the *Civiltà*, had increased in nearly all Roman Catholic countries. In Belgium, Mgr. Dechamps headed the partisans of Infallibility, and at the end of May he wrote a pastoral letter in defence of the definition of the doctrine. It is stated to have had *un retentissement immense*.² And no wonder; for the ground in Belgium was well prepared. The *Civiltà* had obtained a French retailer there in the *Revue Catholique*, which was issued by the theologians of Louvain, and this new Jesuit organ claimed to be in a position to say, that "the wish of the Belgian Catholics would be fulfilled, if the Holy Ghost inspired the Fathers of the Council with the determination to proclaim the infallibility of the Pope as an article of faith."³

In France Dupanloup was still the leader of those opposed to Infallibility, and he perceived with growing anxiety, how Ultramontanism was spreading. On 9th July the old Cardinal Archbishop of Chambéry wrote to him: "What will be the result of these schemes? Offence will be given to the Emperor; he will then withdraw his troops from Rome; the Italians

¹ Ketteler's letter of 8th February 1870 in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1485.

² Lagrange: *Dupanloup* III, 103.

³ Friedrich II, 108.

will march into the town, and they will not so soon go out of it again.”¹ The Bishop of Orléans was not impervious to such considerations; he wished to be a friend both of the Emperor and of the Pope. He had, therefore, to do his utmost to avert the fulfilment of the Jesuit designs. When he heard that the German bishops were going to meet at Fulda, he drew up briefly his view of the situation in a little paper, which he got translated into German, and sent to Fulda in order to prepare the way for joint action by the moderate elements in the French and German episcopate. After that he went to Einsiedeln; but on the way he visited Lord Acton’s family at Herrensheim near Worms, where, to the scandal of all the Ultramontanes, he met with Döllinger.²

At Einsiedeln he received the pastoral letter, which the bishops who were assembled at Fulda had put forth on 6th September. In it the German prelates declare: first, that the Council will not lay down other principles than those which faith and conscience have written in the hearts of all Catholics; secondly, doctrines will never be formulated at a Council which are not contained in Holy Scripture and apostolic tradition; and thirdly, that the Council will only “place the old and original truth in a clearer light.” The pastoral letter declared further that the Council would neither introduce new dogmas, nor interfere in civic life, and that it was the Pope’s intention to give the assembly full liberty during the deliberations.³ These seemed to be pretty clear declarations; but there was a certain ambiguity in the expressions, without which not all the prelates would have signed, and the billows of discussion had run tolerably high in the episcopal gathering. Bishop Ketteler had read a paper by Professor Brentano of Würzburg, who very decidedly counselled that the question of Infallibility should not be raised;⁴ but the successor of St Boniface had also declared, at the same time, that he himself would believe in the Infallibility, if it were defined. Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg,

¹ Lagrange III, 103.

² Count Arco told Gregorovius (*Röm. Tagebuch*, 439) that Dupanloup was then decidedly bent on opposition; he counted on fifty French votes and expected that Germany would supply as many more.

³ Friedberg, 276f. Quirinus, 35f.

⁴ Friedrich II, 176f.

the former Professor of Church History at Tübingen, was not so pliable. He declared openly that he did not believe in the Pope's Infallibility, and that he had studied Church History for thirty years, without finding anything which implied that the ancient Church had believed in this dogma. Bishop Konrad Martin, of Paderborn, replied to this with tears, that his colleague of Rottenburg was lacking in faith. This provoked Hefele; he protested sharply, and said at last that, as regards Infallibility, the question was not one of being opportune or inopportune; Infallibility was simply not true. This utterance gave Molitor, a canon who represented the ailing Bishop of Speier, occasion to remark that Rome would soon pull the heretical hide off the new Bishop of Rottenburg; others also, like Stahl, Bishop of Würzburg, and Ketteler, let fall some caustic remarks directed against Hefele.¹

But most of the bishops took up the same position as Ketteler; they considered the definition of the new dogma "inopportune." They therefore sent the Pope a private letter, in which they advised him, in view of the dangers which threatened, to give up his intention. Some of the bishops, however, would not join in taking this step; and at Rome people were so enraged at the letter of the German bishops, that they pretended that it had not been received. From the Hungarian and Austrian bishops, who had assembled under Cardinal Schwarzenberg's presidency, similar applications were received; but no greater regard was paid to them.

When Dupanloup returned from Einsiedeln, he found the French Catholics in agitation over a pamphlet on "The Council and Religious Peace," which the Dean of the Sorbonne, Maret, Bishop of Sura *in partibus*, had brought out. The Abbé Freppel, who read the pamphlet before it was published, had at once made some critical observations upon it, which the author much resented;² when the book was for sale, the *Univers* opened a violent attack upon it, and several French bishops supported the Jesuit organ. Dupanloup also considered Maret's action highly injudicious;³ but another event made a deeper impression upon him. On 20th September the *Temps* and the *Journal des Débats* published Père Hyacinthe's letter

¹ Acton, 45f.

² Cornut: *Mgr. Freppel*, 145f.

³ Cornut, 152.

announcing to the Carmelite General his withdrawal from the order.¹ This eventful step was not unexpected by the Bishop of Orléans; but it came at a most inopportune moment. The Liberal Catholics saw clearly that Louis Veuillot and his party would not deny themselves the pleasure of using the apostasy of the former preacher of Nôtre Dame as a weapon against them. Both Dupanloup and Montalembert attempted in vain to bring the rebellious Carmelite superior to submission; Hyacinthe Loyson was far advanced beyond the point of discussing whether the dogma of Infallibility were opportune or not.

In his sorrow and perplexity Dupanloup determined to seek an audience of "the silent man," in order to find out what his intentions were, and to see how high ultramontane shares stood in the market at Court. On 3rd October he was received by the Emperor at Saint-Cloud, and after the interview he said to his friends: "I wished to see and I have seen;"² but what he had seen they never learned. The Jesuits thought that he had used the occasion for thwarting the dogmatic plans of the *Univers* and of Ultramontanism,³ and upon him was generally laid the blame for the tone of the despatch which the French Foreign Minister, Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne, sent to the French ambassador at Rome a fortnight after the audience at Saint-Cloud.⁴ In this despatch the government declared that it would not send a special ambassador to the Council, but it also expressed its intention to stand firmly by the Concordat of 1801 against the ultramontane tendency to gather all powers into the Pope's hand, and thus to make the influence of the bishops an unreality. The despatch asserted that the government was aware that the dogma of Infallibility might be made the subject of many subtle distinctions, and it hoped that the utmost caution would be observed as regards the wording of it, if this dogma should really be proclaimed. They firmly trusted at the Tuileries that the Church would not again give trouble to the community, as at the time when the Syllabus was issued; and the French ambassador was to inform the Vatican that the measures taken in 1864 might serve to show how they

¹ Printed in Séché: *Les derniers Jansénistes* III, 79f. Lagrange III, 107f.

² Lagrange III, 109.

³ Maynard, 192f.

⁴ For the first time printed completely in Ollivier I, 519f. Cp. Maynard, 193f.

would proceed if the Council proclaimed similar doctrines. In these guarded words most people read an unambiguous threat of the recall of the French troops.

A week later Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, issued a pastoral letter, calculated to reassure the anxious. He refuted all the fantastic suppositions which had been formed regarding the work of the Council, and rejected, with special emphasis, the idea that the Papal Infallibility could be passed by acclamation. "Common-sense and history," he wrote, "protest against these absurd insinuations. If the Church for most grave reasons arrives at the conclusion that it ought in the future to command us, under penalty of eternal damnation, to believe what it has not hitherto demanded that we should believe, it will not announce with enthusiasm such a fearful punishment as an anathema; and 500 or 600 bishops, who have assembled to discuss such important questions, will not force their opinion through without listening and replying to those honourable difficulties which are advanced with moderation."¹ There can scarcely be any doubt that Darboy himself believed in the victory of the moderate party at the Council. But the papal nuncio at Vienna was perfectly right when he said that the Archbishop of Paris was not an authority for the Holy See,² and therefore no trustworthy interpreter of the plans of the Vatican.

Dupanloup's words were likely to carry greater weight, and he felt himself more and more called upon to speak. On 15th October Mgr. Franchi, the rival of Leo XIII. at the Conclave, and afterwards his Secretary of State, had written to him: "I can inform you of a very important thing. Everybody is beginning to see what dangers our so-called friends have brought us into. At my last audience I found the Holy Father perfectly clear upon all questions, and I have the sure conviction that the Council will carry out the work of peace that we wish for, which will lead society to us, and not separate it more from us."³ The private letter of the German prelates had evidently made a certain impression at the Vatican.

But the ultramontane agitation increased in proportion as

¹ Foulon : *Mgr. Darboy*, 439f.

² See above, p. 270.

³ Lagrange III, 112f.

the meeting of the Council approached. The *Univers* contained each day long lists of priests and laymen who earnestly prayed for the definition of Infallibility; in the land of political plebiscites people were beginning to organise a dogmatic plebiscite. Men like Dupanloup were angered at seeing that part of the Church whose duty it was to be taught, attempt to dictate its decisions to the teaching Church. And what might not happen if there came petitions in the opposite direction, as in Germany? On 10th November, therefore, the Bishop of Orléans issued a pastoral letter, in order again to contribute to the reassurance of people's minds. In this he promised that the forthcoming Council would accomplish a work of unity, truth, and love.¹ Bishop Mermillod became so enthusiastic over this pastoral letter, that he felt as if he were on Mount Tabor when he read it; but he and his associates were undoubtedly less enchanted after reading the *Observations sur la controverse soulevée relativement à la définition de l'infaillibilité au futur Concil*, which Dupanloup published shortly afterwards; for these *Observations*, which tended to show that the definition of the Infallibility was very "inopportune," had a formidable likeness to some of Döllinger's theories, and several of the nearest friends of the Bishop of Orléans, who, like De Falloux, agreed with him, considered that he ought to have kept his *Observations* for the hall of the Council, and the debates there. Louis Veuillot attacked Dupanloup in such an offensive way, that the Bishop thought he ought to answer with heavy ordnance. He wrote his *Avertissement à M. L. Veuillot*. In this pamphlet he calls the editor of the *Univers* the *Accusator fratrum*, and depicts the great church agitator as a man destitute of all theological knowledge, and as one who misuses both the Bible and the Fathers of the Church, in order to elevate the Pope. Dupanloup sent this book to his priests, with the assurance that he would submit himself to whatever the Council should determine, and then he went on his way to Rome, where he took up his abode in the Villa Grazioli.

By that time the members of the Council were beginning to move towards the Eternal City. Only a few of the French bishops remained at home; most of them took their journey

¹ Lagrange III, 115f.

with the verbal or written permission of the government; three bishops went without it. The government did all it could to make easy the communications between the French prelates and the French ministry and their own vicars-general, and when Napoleon opened the Chamber of Deputies on 29th November, he said confidently in the speech from the throne: "From the meeting of the Catholic bishops at Rome we can but expect a work of wisdom and conciliation."¹ People at Rome, therefore, were now at ease regarding the attitude of France. Prince Hohenlohe, who, since the publication of the circular already mentioned, had not concerned himself with the question of the Council,² sent the Bavarian bishops on their journey with an admonition which took the form of a hope that the prophecy of the Fulda Congress might be fulfilled.³ The Prussian Minister of Public Worship, Von Mühler, had at an earlier moment exhorted the Prussian bishops not to forget the rights of their country and their duties towards it,⁴ and both Hohenlohe and Bismarck now ordered the ambassadors at Rome to enter into communication with the German bishops and to warn them against extreme measures.

None of the foreign prelates was so sure of a good reception at the Vatican as Archbishop Manning of Westminster. At the end of October he had sent out a voluminous pastoral letter, which attempted to prove that the definition of Infallibility was not only highly opportune, but necessary; and he had asserted that the Pope must be infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*, even if he be not surrounded by the bishops, an assertion which Dupanloup had attacked in his pastoral.⁵ When Manning was on his way through Paris he saw both Thiers and Guizot. Thiers said to him: "Do not make life bitter for us! Do not condemn the principles of '89; they have got into the blood of all Frenchmen." Guizot is reported to have said that he looked to the Council as the last great

¹ Ollivier I, 531.

² *Weisung der bayerischen Regierung an ihre Bischöfe*, in Friedberg, 353f.

³ Friedberg, 354f.

⁴ This is evident from a despatch from the papal nuncio at Munich, written in the end of October. Cp. Friedrich II, 351. Cardinal Manning's imaginations in his *True History of the Vatican Council* have no basis in fact.

⁵ Purcell: *Manning II*, 425.

moral force which could restore peace to Europe.¹ At Florence Manning met Bishop Mermillod, and these two champions of Infallibility travelled in company to the city of St Peter.

There people were very busy, and full of confident expectation that the forthcoming Council would follow the beck of Ultramontaniam. On 11th April, Pius IX. had celebrated, amidst a great concourse, his fifty years' jubilee as priest. He had then received an address with 1,000,000 signatures, bound in seventeen splendid volumes. From all parts of Roman Catholic Christendom presents came in, which were exhibited in the portico of Bramante's courtyard in the Vatican, and formed quite an industrial exhibition. There was silk from Rome, fruits from Nemi, marble from Scurcola, wine from Velletri and Frascati, pastry from the poor Volscians, coal, live calves, and twelve sacks of corn from Mentana. Six big boxes had arrived from America; at the top was chocolate, under it nuggets of gold from California.² This "golden wedding" assured Pius IX. that he had the greatest part of his flock with him, and from this he took fresh courage to proceed on the way shown him by the Jesuits.

The great question of the Pope's Infallibility was, of course, discussed at Rome as elsewhere, but many thought that the Jesuits, when it came to the point, would perhaps consider it wisest to beat a retreat. It was rumoured that Cardinal Schwarzenberg of Prague had said that he would resign his post and his dignities if the new dogma were proclaimed. And it was also said that Hefele had affirmed that, if it were done, Germany would become Protestant in the course of two years. But the Jesuits had carefully mustered their flock, and they were confident of victory.³

On 2nd December 1869, Pius IX. presided at an introductory meeting in the Sistine Chapel. To the 43 cardinals and 460 archbishops, bishops, and heads of religious orders, who filled the chapel, he delivered a speech in which he identified himself with Christ. After this Cardinal Claretta read the names of the five cardinals (Reisach, De Luca, Bizzarri, Bilio, and Capalti) who were chosen as presidents of the five congregations of the Council, and the names of its officers; and Prince

¹ Purcell II, 426.

² Gregorovius : *Röm. Tagebücher*, 419f.

³ Gregorovius, 443f.

Orsini, who was to be the Protector-general of the gathering, kissed the Pope's foot and took his seat on one of the steps of the throne. A papal brief was then communicated to those assembled, which fixed the order of business. There were to be three different sorts of meetings: commissions (or committee meetings), general congregations (or joint meetings), and sessions (or public meetings). At the first the decisions were to be prepared, at the general congregations they were to be passed, and at the sessions to be published.¹

It aroused serious anxiety in many people that this arrangement had been made without the co-operation of the Council itself,² and that the Pope in the brief laid before them asserted that the right of making proposals belonged properly to him alone, but that he had allowed to the fathers a share in this privilege.³ The first part of this papal pronouncement contained an usurpation; for not even at Trent had the Pope enjoyed a monopoly of making proposals. The last part was unimportant as a concession; for according to the brief all proposals from the members were to be submitted in writing to a committee appointed by the Pope, and not directly to the Council, and Pius IX. reserved the right of deciding how far the proposal sent in ought to be brought under discussion or not. The Vatican Council was, therefore, not to be a "free" Council. General dissatisfaction was also felt, because Pius IX., contrary to the custom at previous Councils, demanded the strictest secrecy as regards the proposed decrees, and all discussions.⁴ But this demand was not complied with. People were well informed in many of the Roman *salons* concerning the course of the discussions and the strength of parties, and the biographer of Cardinal Manning admits openly, that here, as in so many legislative assemblies, the outside meetings had the greatest weight. The most important work, he says, was done outside the Council; it was in the meetings which both parties held outside the Council hall, that votes for and

¹ Friedberg, 358f. and *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 17f.

² Friedrich: *Tagebuch*, 11f.

³ "Was in seinem Rechte des Vorsitzes begründet ist," the secretary of the Council, Bishop Fessler, explains in *Das vatic. Concil*, 34.

⁴ "In Anbetracht der rastlosen Thätigkeit einer sehr böswilligen und einflussreichen, dem Concilium feindlichen, Partei," explains Fessler, *loc. cit.* 35.

against were won.¹ Even the ladies made their contribution. Louis Veuillot spoke scornfully of "the godmothers of the Council" (*commères du Concile*).

The brief about the order of proceedings, which also forbade the bishops to leave Rome during the meeting, seemed to make beforehand the work of a loyal opposition impossible.² The Liberal members of the episcopate murmured accordingly. But they were chiefly offended because the decrees passed at the general congregations were to be read with the introduction: "Pius, Bishop, the servant of God, with the approbation of the Sacred Council (*sacro approbante concilio*) orders," so that the reports were promulgated in the name of the Pope and not of the Council. It had been otherwise at Trent. There the formula ran: "The sacred . . . synod, which is lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, under the presidency of the legates of the Apostolic See, orders and determines." The secretary of the Vatican Council explains the difference between the two formulas by the fact that the Pope was to be present at the promulgation of the decrees of the Vatican Council, while he was not present at the publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent.³ But this is scarcely a sufficient ground of explanation. There is much more in the Vatican formula, and parallels in the acts of former ecumenical councils may be sought for in vain. But Jesuitism was now steering towards a declaration that the decrees of the Roman Pontiff are in themselves (*ex sese*) irreformable and not by consent of the Church.⁴ It also caused dissatisfaction that those who wished to speak had to request leave the day before from the President of the Council—at first Cardinal von Reisach, and after his death (23rd December 1869) Cardinal de Angelis, both known as zealous advocates of the new dogma. Exceptions, however, could be made, when the speakers on the list previously drawn up had all spoken. But as all the speakers were admitted to the rostrum

¹ Purcell II, 427f.

² Pomponio Leto: *Otto mesi a Roma durante il concilio Vaticano* (Firenze 1873), 39. Cp. Hinschius: *Kirchenrecht* III, 455.

³ Fessler, 38f.

⁴ Cp. the exposition of the relation between the Pope and the Councils *after* the Vatican Council in H. M. Pezzani: *Codex S. Cath. Rom. Ecclesiae* (Rome 1893) I, 112f.

according to their rank, it would, as a rule, be easy to prevent a disagreeable critic from speaking. The voting was to be by word of mouth. When the secretary had read out a decree the vote was to be taken Aye (*Placet*) or No (*Non Placet*). The result of the vote was then to be communicated to the Pope, and he would then order it to be made known with the following formula: "The decrees now read have been passed unanimously," or with the exception of such and such a number of votes.

It was a numerous array of prelates who assembled at this Council, which was called the First Council of the Vatican, as if similar ones were expected to follow it. When the Council of Trent was opened, there were only four archbishops and twenty-one bishops present. To the Vatican Council 719 members assembled immediately, and by the middle of January the number had risen to 744—nearly four-fifths of those who had the right to come. It is estimated that about 50 cardinals, 10 patriarchs, 130 archbishops, 522 bishops, and 30 generals of religious orders met at Rome. Out of this number 541 were Europeans (and of these more than half were Italians), 113 Americans, 83 Asiatics, 14 Africans, and 13 Australians.¹ Both England and Geneva, which were not represented at Trent, sent bishops to Rome in 1869—Manning and Mermillod.

The right transept of St Peter's church had been arranged as an *aula*, where both the joint sittings and the public meetings were to be held. Pius IX. expected that a special power would emanate from the grave of the Prince of the Apostles close by. At the entrance stood an altar, and in front of it the pulpit for the speakers. Lengthways down the aisles there were seats with red cushions, first for cardinals and patriarchs, and then for archbishops, bishops, and abbots; in front of them sat the generals of the orders, and in front of these again there were seats for the Secretary of the Council and his assistants. Immediately facing the entrance was erected the papal throne, and near it was a special place for Antonelli. Above the Pope's throne were to be read the words: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."² On the wall opposite might be read a prayer to Mary as the ornament and foundation of the

¹ Friedberg, 99f.

² St Luke xxii. 32.

Church—an indication of the work which awaited the assembled fathers. During the public sessions there were to be places in a couple of galleries for the people, the theologians, singers, diplomatists, crowned heads, the Roman princesses, and others.

On the morning of 8th December volleys of artillery from S. Angelo and the ringing of the church bells announced that the Council was to be opened.¹ From the Sistine Chapel a magnificent procession went forth with song into St Peter's, but a violent downpour of rain made it impossible to carry out the whole ceremony as it had been arranged. The immense space in the church was, for the first time within living memory, completely filled with people; but most of them did not see much. A steam rose from clothes that were wet through, which covered everything with a veil of mist, and the floor of the church was turned by degrees into a most disagreeable slush. The procession passed through the middle aisle into the *aula*, and after a solemn Mass had been said, the secretary, Mgr. Fessler, Bishop of St Pölten, placed an open Bible upon the altar. The Capucin Passavalli, Archbishop of Iconium *in partibus*, who lived in the diocese of Trent, then delivered a Latin sermon, taking as his text Psalm cxxvi. 6, and beginning with a greeting from the place where the last Council had been held.² Pius IX., through Mgr. Cenni, had required Passavalli to emphasise in his sermon how expedient it would be to sanction the belief in the Infallibility of the Pope, which the Church had always held, and had held out to him a cardinal's hat in prospect.³ But the brave Capucin Archbishop was not to be tempted; he said not a single word in favour of Infallibility. After his sermon the cardinals kissed the Pope's hand, the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops his right knee, and the abbots his foot, in token of their obedience to St Peter's successor. When this long and tiring ceremony was over, Pius IX. blessed the assembly, and delivered an address which culminated in a touching appeal to "the Queen of the Church," praying that she would take the work of the Council into her motherly care.⁴ When he came to this invocation of the Madonna, he rose and stretched his arms towards heaven,

¹ Pomponio Leto, 6f. ; Gregorovius, 446f.

² The sermon in Friedberg, 366f.

³ Friedrich II, 425 ; III, 1, 129.

⁴ The speech and the prayer in Friedberg, 372f.

and the whole assembly stood up. *Quel momento era un solenne spettacolo*, says Pomponio Leto. After more prayers the Council was declared open, and those present who could hear what was being said approved of this declaration with their *Placet*, whereupon the next public session was summoned for the Feast of the Epiphany, 6th January, in the following year. Pius IX. was so confident of success that he had already laid the foundation stone of a memorial of the Council in front of S. Pietro in Montorio. But in France, Italy, and Germany on 8th December there were many demonstrations from Roman Catholics against the Council, and at Naples an opposition council of freethinkers was held under the presidency of Count Ricciardi.¹

When the Council opened, the opposition consisted chiefly of four prelates: Schwarzenberg, Dupanloup, Maret, and Darboy.² The Cardinal of Prague had brought with him to Rome a paper (*desideria patribus proponenda*), deprecating the definition of the bodily ascension of Mary and of the Infallibility, because it would cause great difficulties even to the most pious Catholics, but recommending a change in the Index of prohibited books, in order that liberty and scientific research might flourish, and the introduction of democratic arrangements in the Church similar to those which had been recently introduced in Hungary. Dupanloup carried on from Rome an immense correspondence with clergymen, politicians, and newspaper editors, day after day, week after week. As Manning said, he sent letters, articles, and circulars to all the European centres of intrigue, especially to Paris and Munich.³ Maret and Darboy took up a more reserved attitude.

Manning was one of the most important foreign leaders of the adherents of the new dogma. While Dupanloup's special strength lay in the pen, Manning's lay in the spoken word. He was a master in the art of persuasion, made for a Parliamentary whip, and he had at Rome ample use for these gifts. Wherever he went, his first and foremost wish was to enlist votes for Infallibility. Even his own party could scarcely reconcile themselves to the way the energetic Englishman

¹ G. Ricciardi: *L'Anticonciglio di Napoli del 1869* (Napoli 1870). Cp. Friedberg, 88f.

² Acton, 60f.

³ Purcell II, 429.

went on, and they took offence at his "everlasting intrigues."¹ He had free access at any time to Pius IX., and he obtained permission, in spite of his promise of silence, to reveal all the secrets of the Council to the English agent in Rome, Mr Odo Russell. This diplomatist, whose mother was a Roman Catholic,² but who was himself a Protestant, was indeed very useful to Manning. Every Saturday, which was a holiday for the Fathers of the Council, Manning and Odo Russell took a walk together outside the walls of Rome. The Archbishop told Odo Russell during this *Sabbatina*, for the information of Lord Clarendon, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, everything that had happened during the past week; and in return the English agent confided to Manning everything that he knew of the proceedings of the opposition, of the wiles of Döllinger, Lord Acton, the Bavarian government, and other diplomatists. That is why Manning's biographer calls the Archbishop and the Protestant diplomatist "the human agents, in God's hands, for the carrying through of the new dogma."³ Without Odo Russell's support, the diplomatic astuteness of Manning would scarcely have been in a position to ward off the "fatal" diplomatic intervention, which hovered steadily over the heads of the Council.

But the opposition had likewise a layman who played an important part, and, strangely enough, an Englishman likewise. It was Lord Acton, Döllinger's friend and disciple, afterwards Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. Some letters in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, which were extremely unpleasant reading for the adherents of Infallibility,⁴ were ascribed to the noble lord; and it was known that Lord Acton stood in continual communication with Gladstone, who was then Prime Minister. He was also intimately acquainted with Darboy and Dupanloup. The French and German bishops of the opposition met at his *salon*, and he had therefore good opportunities of making them familiar with the historical ordinance brought up by Döllinger and Friedrich. Next to

¹ Purcell II, 432.

² Purcell II, 438. "But too much devoted to Bossuet, Fénelon, and Fleury to find favour in your eyes," the son wrote to Manning.

³ Purcell II, 436.

⁴ K. Hase: *Handb. der protest. Polemik* (5 Aufl. 1890) 33, 232f.

the Bishop of Orléans, Lord Acton was, in Manning's opinion, the man who did most to stir ill-feeling against the Council. The Archbishop of Westminster plainly accuses his countryman of "poisoning" Gladstone's mind, by inculcating upon him hostility to Ultramontanism and Infallibility.¹

The prelates of the opposition began to move immediately, and fourteen French bishops, and Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar in Bosnia, sent in a request on 9th December for a change in the method of procedure, so that the necessary freedom might be secured to the Council.² The German and Austrian bishops had been asked to support the petition, but they refused, because it was too early, they thought, to appear publicly in that way.³ The whole proceeding was so much trouble wasted; the fifteen bishops did not even receive an answer.⁴

The first general congregation, as distinguished from a public session, was held on 10th December.⁵ Bishop Vitelleschi, who is said to have been the real author of the book entitled *Otto mesi a Roma durante il concilio Vaticano*, published under the pseudonym of "Pomponio Leto," opened the meeting with the Mass of the Holy Ghost. Then Archbishop Darboy requested leave to speak, to protest against the method of procedure forced upon the Council, but Cardinal de Luca refused permission. The first point in the order of the day was the publication of the names of the twenty-six members, who, according to the Pope's pleasure, were to form the important commission which tried all applications sent in by the Fathers of the Council. The majority were jubilant when they heard the twenty-six names; for most of those selected were adherents of Infallibility. Twenty out of the twenty-six were Roman; and Riario Sforza, Archbishop of Naples, Bonnechose of Rouen, Cullen of Dublin, Moreno of Valladolid, Dechamps, Manning, and Conrad Martin were known not only as staunch infallibilists, but as ultramontane agitators

¹ Purcell II, 434.

² Printed in Friedrich: *Documenta ad illustr. Concilium Vaticanum* (Nördlingen 1871) II, 38of.

³ Friedrich: *Geschichte des Vatik. Konzils* III, 1, 144.

⁴ Friedrich: *Documenta* I, 136 (Darboy: *La Liberté au Concile*).

⁵ Pomponio Leto, 50; Friedrich: *Geschichte des Vat. Konzils* III, 1, 148.

in their respective countries. Next a dogmatic scheme was distributed—that adoption of the Syllabus as matter of dogma, which had been foreseen with such anxiety by the minority.¹ A hasty glance at the voluminous document was enough to show the minority that opposition must be offered on this point, as well as on others. The French bishops therefore immediately felt that they were face to face with an ultramontane conspiracy, and they hinted that they could in no wise allow themselves to be treated in such a fashion.² But yet another surprise was in store for them. A papal Bull was issued, which forbade the Council to interfere in the election of a Pope, in case Pius IX. were to die during the meeting. The Council was in that case to be immediately suspended, and it could not meet again except at the bidding of the new Pope.³

This first general congregation was not calculated to inspire the opposition with confidence, and the opposition bishops' hope of fruitful discussions was still further reduced by the bad acoustic properties of the *aula*. The secretary had to turn in each direction and repeat what he had to say, and at one of the first meetings there were bishops who, instead of *Placet* or *Non Placet*, said *Nihil intelleximus*: "We have not understood a word."⁴ In addition, rumours were current in Rome of what Pius IX. had said. He had allowed himself to affirm that the *Positivismo* of the Germans must be ejected before things could come right; and when Cardinal Schwarzenberg, during an audience, was bold enough to express doubts regarding the definition of Infallibility, the Pope answered: "I, Giovanni Maria Mastai, believe in the Infallibility;" and he likewise informed the Cardinal of Prague that he had at one time entertained doubts as to whether it was opportune to proclaim the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.⁵ It was already evident that an opposition which only dared to deny the opportuneness of the proposed definition would have a tough fight, and little hope of victory.

The Jesuits, therefore, felt safe. They asserted that the

¹ Printed in Friedrich: *Documenta* II, 37.

² Friedrich: *Geschichte* III, I, 154f., according to unpublished letters.

³ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 45f.

⁴ Pomponio Leto, 65.

⁵ Friedrich III, I, 158f.

opposition was dwindling day by day, so that soon a microscope would be needed in order to see it. This was a phrase; but it had its effect. At the second general congregation, on 14th December, amongst other things, members were to be chosen for the important commission on the faith. When the result of the election was made known a few days afterwards, it was seen that not one of the minority had been elected, but four and twenty adherents of Infallibility. Mgr. Pie, who was elected as No. 2, considered that everything was going better than had been expected, and in a letter to the Vicar-General of Bordeaux he spoke of this election as "the musical key to the Council," because it showed what might be expected in regard to dogma.¹ And to Manning the Infallibilist majority was "the Council."

But the election above mentioned had also revealed that the opposition commanded 150 or 200 of the 700 votes; so that it was not altogether microscopic. And when the votes were weighed, the minority was still more imposing. Most of the bishops of the opposition had real dioceses, while 200 of the majority had their sees *in partibus infidelium*. More than half of the majority consisted of Italians, and 300 of the Infallibility bishops lived at Rome at the cost of Pius IX.; but on the side of the minority stood the bishops of the most enlightened nations—Americans, Germans, and French—and the opponents of Infallibility were economically independent. In face of such a large minority as was here brought to light, it was in any case impossible to carry the new dogma by acclamation. When Darboy examined the list of the members of the Council more closely, he found that the enormous preponderance of the Italians destroyed the true ecumenical character of the Council,² and he declared that he and his friends would leave the Council with a protest if the idea of acclamation were not abandoned.³

At the third general congregation on 20th December, the members of the commission for discipline were chosen. When the result was made known a few days afterwards (23rd December), it was seen that only two of the opposition,

¹ Baunard : *Mgr. Pie* II, 373f.

² *La liberté au concile* in Friedrich : *Documenta* I, 138.

³ Acton, 72f. Quirinus, 134. Friedrich : *Tagebuch*, 57.

MacCloskey of New York and Ullathorne of Birmingham, were chosen for this committee. "The Council is Ultramontane," L. Veuillot exclaimed after the election; and he rejoiced that it must now be clear to everybody that Ultramontanism was not a party but the Church itself.¹

On the day before the result of this election was known, Bishop Ketteler had a long audience of Pius IX. The Pope received him with the well-known question from the gospel, *Amas Me?* "Lovest thou Me?" and when Ketteler answered with assurances of his attachment, Pius IX. repeated his question.² He then invited the Bishop of Mainz to take a seat, and the successor of St Boniface explained his ideas with regard to the necessary conditions for a valid Council, and to the opportuneness of the impending decision. But Pius was inaccessible to recommendations based on prudential reasons, and Ketteler left the Vatican with a heavy heart. He was scarcely comforted when he heard the next day that Cardinal Schwarzenberg, "in order not to compromise himself further," refused to sign the address to Pius IX., which Ketteler and some other bishops from Germany and Austria-Hungary had with great trouble put into a suitable form.³ Vacillation and uncertainty were present everywhere in the ranks of the opposition, and the stronger characters, like Bishop Strossmayer, complained that several of the bishops had not the courage to uphold what they considered right.⁴

At this juncture the first articles about the Council in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* reached Rome, and everybody was amazed at seeing many secret thoughts and confidential utterances exposed to general criticism. Most people thought that it was Professor Johann Friedrich, Cardinal Hohenlohe's theologian, who had written these letters, and the Palazzo Valentini, where Hohenlohe lived, was looked upon as the centre of the opposition. The bishops agreed to keep a guard upon their tongues; but in order properly to refute false reports, Dechamps, Senestrey, and Mermillod obtained a permission, like Manning's, to supply certain laymen with trustworthy

¹ Friedrich : *Geschichte* III, I, 236.

² Quirinus, 139.

³ Friedrich : *Tagebuch*, 39.

⁴ Friedrich : *Geschichte* III, I, 231.

information as to the progress of affairs.¹ Antonelli informed the bishops at the same time that, by the Pope's orders, they must not assemble at any large private meetings; not more than fifteen or twenty persons might meet together outside of the Council.

On 28th December the debate on the dogmatic scheme *de fide*, already mentioned,² was to take place at the fourth general congregation. The excitement was great; for several prominent members of the episcopate had expressed themselves very contemptuously about the document put into their hands. Cardinal Hohenlohe had called it "a wretched bungle," and Haynald had said: *C'est une dyssenterie des paroles*.³ The excitement grew still greater when it was rumoured that the acclamation, which they still feared, was to take place during this meeting. Darboy asked Cardinal de Luca, who was to preside on 28th December, whether the rumour was true. The Cardinal answered that the acclamation would not take place on the 28th, but that he could not answer for the days following—very likely because the Pope meant to appoint Cardinal de Angelis to preside thenceforth in the place of Cardinal Reisach, who was dead. After this answer the opposition gave the majority to understand that 100 bishops had agreed to leave Rome immediately, and "to take the Council with them in their shoes" if the acclamation took place.⁴

Cardinal Rauscher opened the discussion of the proposed scheme; his speech, which lasted for an hour, ended with the criticism that it was far too much like a theological compendium.⁵ Others judged it still more severely. The blind Tizzani, Archbishop of Nisibis, who was head chaplain to the papal forces, said that the scheme was only "words, words, and nothing but words." Archbishop Connolly, of Halifax, closed the meeting by affirming that it was only fit to be "buried with honour"; and this judgment flew round Rome like a winged word.⁶ The majority sat crestfallen during the

¹ Friedrich: *Geschichte* III, 1, 246.

² P. 323.

³ Friedrich III, 1, 239f.

⁴ Acton, 72f.

⁵ Wolfsgruber: *Card. Rauscher*, 430.

⁶ Friedrich III, 1, 324f.

whole discussion. Many considered that Cardinal de Luca ought at once to have stopped Rauscher's trenchant criticism, and Antonelli perceived that ten years might pass before the end was reached, if the Council continued to work as it had begun. But the minority rejoiced.

The discussion of the scheme was continued at several successive meetings, and it received the same unkind treatment from most sides. Strossmayer, among the rest, criticised it sharply; but when he ventured in the course of his speech to blame also the form prescribed for the publication of the decrees of the Council, he was interrupted, not by De Luca, who presided, but by Cardinal Capalti, who was vice-president, with the remark that it was not permitted to discuss the order of procedure and the form of the decrees. In spite of this declaration, a good many of the German and Austrian bishops summoned courage and sent in humble petitions for the relaxation of a few points in the method of procedure. Schwarzenberg and Rauscher thought of taking these suggested amendments to Pius IX. themselves, but they gave it up, when a Roman cardinal dissuaded them from doing so with the remark that they would scarcely get anything from the Pope except his blessing.¹ The addresses were therefore sent to the Vatican. They were, of course, put aside without having had the slightest effect, but at the following general congregations the members of the minority were allowed to talk as much as they pleased against the unhappy scheme; the liberty of the Council was thereby apparently demonstrated. But the scheme found defenders also. Konrad Martin, of Paderborn, defended it bravely, and also expressed his surprise that anyone should have dared to treat with such disdain a draft approved by the Pope. The criticism was nevertheless continued, to the annoyance of the Jesuits.

As has been mentioned, a public session was summoned for the Feast of the Epiphany (6th January). Since the Council had no result to show, this meeting had to occupy itself with something else than reports of the result of the deliberations. The Jesuits therefore conceived the plan of getting the members to take an oath to the form of faith adopted by the Council of Florence. It was quite a clever idea; for Pius IX. could

¹ Friedrich III, I, 346.

thereby both conceal his defeat, and get the Council bound to that formula of belief, which was looked upon as the best support of the Infallibility. The plan was abandoned, however, and the public session on 6th January was occupied by each of the 700 prelates pledging himself to the Tridentine confession of faith to the Pope in person—as they had all done at their ordination. The opposition was deeply hurt at seeing the Council turned into a *Cappella Pontificia*, and the Secretary of the Council makes vain attempts to defend this superfluous ceremony.¹ To cancel the meeting would have been far more natural even if somewhat humiliating.

As matters had developed, the champions of Infallibility were obliged to proceed in another and more difficult manner than they had at first contemplated. A private committee, amongst them the most zealous champions of Infallibility, endeavoured to collect signatures to an address, in which the Pope was requested to proclaim the dogma in question.² They had expected to obtain 500 or 600 names, but obtained only 410; and Konrad Martin in his zeal had even added to the address the name of a bishop, Krementz, of Ermeland, who was at that time an opponent of Infallibility.³ An archbishop belonging to the minority succeeded in securing a copy of this address, to which was cleverly added an appendix containing quotations from pronouncements of various recent provincial synods, whereby men like Schwarzenberg and Kenrick were made out to be adherents of Infallibility. In order to promote the agitation, a sermon was preached every day from 6th to 16th January in S. Andrea della Valle for the glorification of Infallibility. Mermillod preached on 9th January on the three "Bethlehems"—the manger, the tabernacle, and the Vatican—as the three weak things which had conquered the world; in the manger, a Child; in the tabernacle, the Host; in the Vatican, an old man; and he assured his hearers that the Protestants of Germany, England, France, and Holland did not believe in Christ and the Gospels; Christ, therefore, had not built His Church on Constantinople nor on Geneva, but on the Vatican. This sermon was so bold that not even the "good" ultramontane Press dared to print it, and Arch-

¹ Fessler, 61.

² Friedberg, 465f.

³ Friedrich: *Tagebuch*, 139.

bishop Haynald could not refrain from asking Mermillod: "In which storey of the Vatican does Christ live?"¹ On the same day that Mermillod preached this sermon, Pius IX., in a speech to about 1,500 persons, characterised the bishops of the minority as "leaders of the blind," and various reports were set afloat to blacken the leaders of that party. It was related that Dupanloup was an illegitimate son; the most damaging stories were spread abroad about Strossmayer's life; and in several countries addresses were circulated in support of Infallibility. These were called "an immense cry from Catholic consciences."

The minority now considered that the time was come for addresses against Infallibility. Cardinal Rauscher drafted the addresses on behalf of the German and Austrian bishops, which pointed out the difficulties surrounding the new dogma,² and declared it to be both superfluous and far from opportune. In a short time this address received many signatures, amongst others that of Hefele. He had just arrived in Rome, and on account of his great historical learning he was a formidable support to the opposition. The French, the Americans, the Orientals, and the Italians prepared similar addresses. Manning was very eager to get hold of the utterances of the opposition, but Odo Russell was obliged to inform him, on 29th January, that he had not succeeded in getting possession of a single copy. He could only say that the address, which consisted of five documents signed by different nationalities, had been sent to Pius IX. through Mgr. Pacca, and that it had been at first intended to have it presented by four archbishops, but that each of these four had declared that three would be sufficient.³

This battle of addresses could not do otherwise than lessen the interest of the debates in the general congregations—and all the more because the acoustic properties of the *aula*, in spite of some slight alterations, were still so bad that a real discussion was impossible. The bishops of the opposition dared not, however, forbear to take part in the debate on the proposed scheme, lest it should finally be adopted. In the

¹ Friedrich III, 1, 387f.

² "Attamen silentio premere non licet, graves nihilominus superesse difficultates ex Patrum Ecclesiæ dictis gestisque, genuinis historiæ documentis et ipsa doctrina Catholica enatas." Friedberg, 473.

³ Purcell: *Manning* II, 438.

general congregation of 10th January they succeeded at last in getting it referred to the commission *pro rebus fidei*, in order to receive the necessary alterations there. It seems to have been a brilliant and spirited speech of the Hungarian Archbishop Haynald which effected this result.¹ But the danger had not passed, even with this recall of the scheme. The commission *pro rebus fidei* went on the assumption that the opposition was only against the form of the scheme, not against its contents. According to the genuine Roman view, the Council's business was only to discuss the form, since the contents, which were taken from papal constitutions, were above its criticism.² The next step, according to this view, would be to present the scheme in a somewhat altered form, and so to take a vote upon it. If then, as seemed decidedly most probable, it should receive more *Placets* than *Non Placets*; it would be possible to proceed at once to a proclamation. This whole mode of procedure had the advantage that it was thus fixed that the principle of majorities should be decisive in matters of faith. The obnoxious scheme, however, was for the present entrusted to a sub-committee, consisting of the Bishops Gasser, of Brixen, Konrad Martin, and Pie, who, on the basis of a short *précis* of all the speeches, undertook a revision of it, having regard to that part of the episcopal criticism which Rome could adopt.

The days following the rejection of the scheme *de fide* were comparatively quiet. Some of the French bishops, headed by Darboy, determined, on 13th January, to send to the commission for applications a request drafted at an earlier date—*postulata seu potius vota*—for better arrangements with regard to the education of the clergy, for a reform of certain points in the inner life of the monasteries, for an extension of the right of the bishops to grant dispensations, for changes in the composition of the College of Cardinals, and in the work of the Congregation of the Index, and various other matters—a complete programme of church reform.³ Several weak spots in the life of the Church were here touched upon, and many members of the majority would have been able to join in the

¹ Pomponio Leto, 82.

² Friedrich III, 1, 424f.

³ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 832.

contention of the French bishops. But the Vatican was in a state of uproar at this step, which would direct the chief part of the Council's work to quite other matters than Ultramontanism desired. Two Dominicans of the Inquisition immediately went to Cardinal Hohenlohe's house, and asked him to use his influence to keep the German bishops from following the example of the French. "It is frightful," they said to the Cardinal; "what will become of Rome? These bishops are working for a decentralisation of the Church."

The wish of the Inquisition was expressed too late, and in the wrong place. The German bishops had already at Fulda agreed to bring forward proposals for reform, and on 8th January their application was ready. It expressed not only wishes for a revision of the Index, and of the Breviary, because the latter contained passages which, in the opinion of the bishops, were contrary to history and sound exegesis of Scripture, but also wishes for more effective means of removing immoral priests, and for a decree against the Freemasons and the secret societies.¹ Although the *postulata* of the French bishops were more distressing, inasmuch as Napoleon and the French troops were behind them, still the suggestions of the German bishops were also extremely disagreeable. At the Vatican they were looked upon as a fresh proof of the unbearable love of opposition which had taken possession of these bishops, although even the friends of the Curia were obliged to confess that everything at Rome proved rotten and crumbling when touched.²

In the general congregation of 14th January it was again impressed upon the bishops that any breach of the duty of silence was a great sin, and that the speakers at the Council should strive to express themselves as briefly as possible, and should especially refrain from repeating what others had already said. At the same time two new schemes were laid before them. The one was concerned with the bishops, synods, and vicars-general; the other with the arrangements to be made when a see became vacant.³ If these proposals were adopted, the episcopate would become still more dependent upon the

¹ *Collectio Lacensis*, 873f.

² For instance, Professor de Angelis at the Sapienza; Friedrich, *Tagebuch*, 108f.

³ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 641f, 651f.

Curia. Paolo Sarpi in his time complained that the bishops entered the Council of Trent as bishops, but left it as simple priests; the bishops did not wish at this Council to lose still more of their influence and power.¹

Cardinal Schwarzenberg opened the debate by calling for a reform of the College of Cardinals, which was clearly as necessary as the proposed changes in the position of the episcopate.² Darboy eloquently described the work and position of a bishop; it could be seen through his words with what bitterness he contemplated the position which it was proposed hereafter to give to the bishops. His expressions became more and more scorching. "It was," says Pomponio Leto, "as it were, the Parisian archbishop's cry of warning to the Church; after uttering it he disappeared like a stranger from a world strange to him."³ But Melchers' words attracted almost greater attention. The Archbishop of Cologne was looked upon as being one of the most "correct" of bishops, and now he also was heard to complain of the centralisation at Rome. He spoke so sharply and so long, that Cardinal de Luca at last became impatient, and interrupted him with the remark that he was going outside of the question, but Melchers would not be silenced. He informed the assembly that many years before, and again quite recently, he had said to Rome what he was now saying, but he had never received an answer. He therefore considered it expedient to bring the matter before the Council. The Germans were enraptured over this spirited speech of Melchers, and when later in the day he entered the meeting of the German bishops, he was received with a thrice-repeated "Hoch."⁴

Afterwards both Ketteler and Dupanloup spoke in the same strain as Darboy and Melchers, and on 24th January Strossmayer also took part in the debate. He declared that not only the College of Cardinals, but also the see of St Peter and the Roman Congregations were in need of reforms. The Papacy ought to be "universalised"; it had, to its own unmitigated loss, become an Italian institution, and the

¹ Pomponio Leto, 94.

² Quirinus, 157. Friedrich III, I, 443.

³ Pomponio Leto, 95.

⁴ Friedrich III, I, 451f.

centralisation which others also had complained of strangled the life of the Church. Strossmayer went so far as to call the canon law "that confusion of Babel," composed as it was of unpractical and more or less apocryphal canons, and he protested against the abuse which was often made of quotations from the Bible, as when it was asserted that there must be only one vicar-general of a diocese, because, in Ephesians iv. 6, it is written that there is only one God. His speech was an event which, as Dupanloup wrote, made the suppression of the minority impossible.¹

The last to speak was the Patriarch of Babylon, a man of seventy-eight years of age, who got another bishop to read on his behalf a complaint against the aggressions of the Propaganda on the Orientals. He prayed that his Church might be allowed to retain its ancient customs, and uttered a warning against alterations which might easily destroy the Oriental Church. This speech looked like an appeal from the Pope to the Council, and Pius IX. took the boldness of the Patriarch very much amiss. After the meeting, the aged Patriarch was summoned to the Vatican, and Pius IX., in his anger, gave him the choice between resignation or the signing of a document which would bring him and the Chaldæan Church into entire dependence upon Rome. The Patriarch preferred the latter.²

Since the two new schemes had not received any better treatment than the scheme *de fide*, the president withdrew them also at the end of the discussion, and sent them to the commission for discipline. There they were quietly buried. The Vatican had now learned that it was dangerous to open up disciplinary questions, because they provoked the minority's criticism of the existing state of affairs, without awakening the fanaticism and enthusiasm of the majority.

While minds thus came into collision at the Council, the literary battle was continued outside of it.

Dupanloup had wished to answer the attacks which Archbishop Dechamps had directed against his pastoral letter, but Padre Spada, who was the *magister sacri palatii*, informed him

¹ Friedrich III, I, 461f.

² *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, translated in *Stimmen aus der kath. Kirche* II, 180f. Cp. Friedrich: *Tagebuch*, 140f.

that such an answer could not be printed at Rome without an *imprimatur*, and that an *imprimatur* could not in this case be expected.¹ Two months later it was printed at Naples; but as the Vatican wished to stop the mouth of Dupanloup, his countryman, Père Gratry, the learned Oratorian, came forward with a letter on Infallibility, which drew attention to the popes who had been convicted of heresy, and bore testimony against "the school of error and of lies" (*école d'erreur et de mensonge*) which made a misuse of history. Gratry's letter created the greatest alarm in all ultramontane circles, but Pius IX. comforted the anxious by saying that it was no wonder if the forces of hell wished to try their strength now, when the whole Church was assembled in Council.² Many of the French bishops condemned the bold Oratorian, but Père Gratry was not to be stopped. When Archbishop Dechamps answered him, he wrote a new letter in which he proved that Melchior Canus, Bellarmine, and Alfonso Liguori had chiefly supported the doctrine of the Pope's Infallibility by false quotations and forgeries, like those of the Pseudo-Isidore; and, in the case of Liguori, by "pure fabrications." He concluded with the assertion that this doctrine is distinctly false, and that the great theologians of former times who adopted it, were deceived by things which are now clearly acknowledged to be lies and frauds. He therefore demanded that the temple should be cleansed, not only of those who trafficked in it, but also of those who coined false religious and moral money. This manifesto caused fresh indignation and fresh joy. Count Montalembert, from his death-bed, sent "a grateful and admiring greeting" to "the eloquent and intrepid priest," and to "the great and noble-minded Bishop of Orléans." By Montalembert's death, on 13th March, French Ultramontanism was put in a painful position. The *Univers* had to acknowledge that no layman had done the Church such great services as he. But he had not only hailed Gratry's action with sympathy; he had also let fall certain words about "the idol in the Vatican," which were highly offensive to the

¹ Dupanloup's letter in the *Gazette de France* of 17th January, Friedberg, 87f. See Friedrich III, I, 478 as to the assertion of the Ultramontanes that Dupanloup has given "eine nicht richtige Darstellung der Sachlage."

² In a letter to Ségur of 22nd January, Friedrich III, I, 489.

Ultramontanes. Louis Veuillot was, therefore, under the painful necessity of "being able neither to praise him nor lament for him as he deserved."¹

Another of the best sons of the Roman Church was quite as little enthusiastic for the ultramontane policy. Newman from his Oratory wrote a troubled letter to Bishop Ullathorne, of Birmingham,² which was at first circulated in copies, afterwards through the newspapers. In it he complained that Councils were now creating dangers instead of averting them as formerly. "What have we done," he asked, "to be treated as the faithful were never treated before? When has a definition *de fide* (of an article of faith) been a luxury of devotion, and not a stern, painful necessity? Why should an aggressive, insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad?" He comforted himself by invoking the great Doctors of the Church—Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Basil—that by their intercession they might turn away the great misfortune which threatened. But he concluded by saying: "If it is God's will that the Pope's Infallibility is defined, then is it God's will to throw back . . . that triumph which He has destined for His kingdom."³ In England voices were also raised, which called to mind the fact that it was the Gallican stamp of English Catholicism which had procured many votes for the Emancipation Bill. Under the heading "The Infallibility of the Pope a Protestant invention," the *Pall Mall Gazette* communicated a fragment from a "Controversial Catechism" which Manning's organ, the *Tablet*, and several bishops had previously recommended. This catechism contained the question: "Are not Catholics bound to believe that the Pope in himself is infallible?" Answer: "This is a Protestant invention. . . . No papal decision can bind under pain of heresy, unless received and prescribed by the teaching body, the bishops of the Church."⁴

From Germany also there came a literary remonstrance of the greatest importance. On 8th January Count Arnim in a

¹ Baunard : *Le Card. Pie* II, 392f. Maynard : *Mgr. Dupanloup*, 259.

² At the end of January 1870, Odo Russell wrote to Manning: "Bishop Ullathorne has joined the ranks of the opposition." Purcell II, 439.

³ Printed in H. J. Jennings : *Card. Newman* (London 1882), 110f.

⁴ Quirinus (English tr.), 97.

letter to Döllinger had said that "the influence of the Roman spirit began to make the bishops more pliable." The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* was able a week later to publish the Latin text of the address in favour of Infallibility, which Manning and Dechamps had put in circulation;¹ it argued that it was the duty of the Council to speak and not to be silent on such an important question. This address called Döllinger forth once more — this time in his own name. On 21st January the *Allgemeine Zeitung* had on the first page an article, in which he protested against the idea that 180,000,000 of people, under threat of exclusion from the Church and of eternal damnation, were hereafter to be compelled to believe and confess what the Church had hitherto neither believed nor taught. The town of Munich offered the learned historian the honorary freedom of the city, and from many parts of Germany came expressions of confidence, and of encouraging adhesion to Döllinger's protest against the contemplated addition to the Roman Church's confession of faith. But Bishop Ketteler solemnly renounced his teacher and friend of the Frankfort Parliament, who now spoke as a follower of that "Janus," in whose writings the Bishop of Mainz saw a parallel to Pascal's *Provincial Letters*.²

And in spite of all protests and literary criticisms the Roman Jesuits proceeded confidently towards their goal. On 21st January, before the debate was concluded on the schemes which have been mentioned,³ a new scheme was circulated: "Of the Church."⁴ It contained a number of the sentences in the Syllabus in positive form, and in one of the *Canones* that accompanied it were found the words: "He who says that the Pope of Rome has only an office of supervision and administration, but not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, or that his power does not ordinarily and immediately concern all Churches—let him be anathema."⁵ In this scheme, which speaks only of the Pope's power and rights, but forgets the importance of the episcopate, there was much that was bound to offend the Non-Ultramontane bishops;

¹ *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung*, 1870, No. 16, *Beilage*.

² Friedberg, 505f.

³ P. 333.

⁴ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 567f. Friedberg, 444f.

⁵ Canon XVI.

and as early as 9th February 1870, the Austrian and German bishops of the minority offered a representation with regard to the discussion of this scheme, which plainly indicated that serious criticism might be expected from their side.¹

A storm appeared to be threatening from the direction of France also. The Ollivier ministry, which was formed on 2nd January, was at first agreed not to interfere with the deliberations of the Council, and especially to look upon the Infallibility as a purely ecclesiastical question which did not concern the State.² The Foreign Secretary, Count Daru, was certainly in close connexion with Montalembert, Gratry, and the other Liberal French Catholics, and he entertained in particular a great regard for Dupanloup; but for some time he was obliged to follow the lines of policy upon which the Cabinet was agreed. In a despatch of 8th January to the French ambassador at Rome, the Marquis de Banneville, he had declared, that the new government would adhere to the non-intervention policy of the former one as long as the Concordat was not violated. When a former Minister of Public Worship, of Gallican sympathies, Rouland, interpellated the government in the Senate on 11th January about the policy of France towards Rome, Daru answered by reading this instruction to the Marquis de Banneville, and added some phrases, which were to prove that there was no ground of fear whatever with regard to the work of the Council, so long as it was left with free hands.³ But after the address of the majority respecting the proclamation of Infallibility his words became quite different. After that, he was of opinion that the French ambassador ought to warn the Vatican against setting up dogmas, which might estrange many good French, English, and German people from the Catholic Church.⁴ On 18th January he even wrote to a good friend, Dupanloup's Vicar-General, that he had heard with regret what was happening at Rome. "It is impossible," he wrote, "to be so blind as to believe that we shall be able to keep our troops at Rome a single day after

¹ This representation *de disponenda discussione schematis de Ecclesiæ Christi* is in Friedrich: *Documenta* II, 885f.

² Ollivier II, 33.

³ The discussions in Friedberg, 521f.

⁴ Ollivier II, 88f.

the proclamation of Infallibility. Even if we would, we could not. Public opinion in France will create an irresistible movement, to which we must needs give way."¹

Before this letter reached Rome, both parties of the Council had begun to bring influence to bear on the French government. Archbishop Lavigerie, of Algiers, who had suddenly set off for Paris to discuss an education question with Ollivier, the Minister of Public Worship,² endeavoured, at the same time, to make the minister understand that the proclamation of Infallibility was a necessity. Darboy, on 26th January, sent the Emperor a letter, in which he complained of the Council's want of freedom, and expressed the wish that both religious and civil society would come to the help of the minority, if not in any other way, then at least with an expression in the Legislative Assembly³ of the dissatisfaction felt by the government at various things in the Council. Such a declaration, however, could not be expected, since Ollivier, the leading minister, considered everything there to be excellent.

At this juncture, Austria, which had formerly taken up a position entirely opposed to Hohenlohe's proposals,⁴ began to be uneasy. On 22nd January the *Civiltà Cattolica* had published an article on *I Politicastri ed il Concilio*, which everywhere attracted the greatest attention.⁵ The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* on 6th February printed a telegram, which thus reproduced the contents of the article: "The bishops will scorn the threats of certain Catholic statesmen; the measures of governments with regard to the bishops at the Council will be of no consequence, and will have no binding effect upon the conscience of their subjects. If the governments separate the Church from the State, they will provoke fearful revolutions which will cause them to fall themselves."⁶ In the face of such language, Count Beust could not be silent. Without delay on

¹ Friedberg, 136.

² Ollivier II, 96f.

³ The letter in Ollivier II, 91f. Foulon's biography of Darboy, compiled in the usual way of saints' lives, such as the biographers of the French bishops use, is satisfied with saying concerning this important step: "Notre impartialité nous fait un devoir de ne point passer sous silence cette lettre, qui, incontestablement, donne lieu à de graves réserves." Foulon: *Vie de Mgr. Darboy*, 461.

⁴ See p. 301.

⁵ *Civiltà Cattolica*, Ser. VII, vol. ix., 257f.

⁶ *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung*, 1870, No 37.

10th February he sent a long despatch to Count Trautmannsdorff at Rome, in which he expressed his uneasiness about the twenty-one canons,¹ and emphasised the firm determination of the Austrian government to maintain "the line of demarcation between Church and State," which had been drawn in a former despatch. The ambassador was ordered to inform Antonelli, and through him Pius IX., that Austria reserved to herself the right to forbid the publication of all documents in which the government perceived a violation of the majesty of the laws, and that it would proceed against anybody who ventured to incur the guilt of trespassing against its prohibitions.² Shortly afterwards Count Beust sent similar despatches to the Austrian ambassadors at Berlin and Munich, in which he explained that the action of Austria was due to the part which denominational questions played in Austria-Hungary, and the difficulties connected with the new constitution. "The government," he wrote, "as matters now stand, must not allow anybody to doubt that it will with vigilance and energy defend the supremacy of the State against the claims of the Catholic hierarchy."³

The action of Austria did not make any special impression upon the Vatican. Antonelli asserted in a conversation with Count Trautmannsdorff, that it was both the right and the duty of the Church to lay down her own principles, and he called the attention of the Austrian ambassador to the self-contradiction, which manifestly lay in the Austrian acknowledgment of the freedom of the Press and its prohibition of the publication of certain ecclesiastical decrees.⁴ A couple of months after, Antonelli sent instructions to the papal nuncio at Vienna to the effect that he was to maintain to the utmost that there was no reason whatever to fear the Vatican Council; it would assuredly understand how to render to Cæsar what was Cæsar's.⁵

At the beginning of February, new storm-clouds appeared

¹ See p. 336.

² The despatch in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1570f. Cp. F. F. von Beust: *Aus drei Viertel-Jahrhunderten* II, 404f.

³ The despatches to Berlin and Munich in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1572f.

⁴ Count Trautmannsdorff's despatch of 19th February in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1576f.

⁵ Antonelli's despatch of 20th April in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1588f.

in the sky over the Council; it was rumoured that the Pope meant to force a new order of procedure upon the assembly, by which the bishops' freedom of speech would be restricted. Four of the episcopal members of the Council addressed themselves on the subject, first to four of the leading cardinals, and afterwards to the ambassadors of their respective governments. They found willing ears, but no great encouragement. Count Trautmannsdorff, who, on behalf of his government, had expressed his full satisfaction with the conduct of the Austro-Hungarian bishops,¹ had no confidence that anything could be done until the governments were agreed upon united action; and the prospects of such action were remote. The Austrian and Hungarian bishops, therefore, seriously contemplated quitting Rome and the Council, lest they should be accomplices in decisions which could not be carried into effect in their native lands.²

The atmosphere at Rome became day by day more oppressive for the minority. On 14th February the *Moniteur* contained an article on affairs at Rome. The article is said to have been written by Dupanloup's Vicar-General, and was undoubtedly a true expression of the view of the minority. It gave a very dark picture of the state of things in the city of St Peter. The bitterness at the Vatican against those bishops who would not give way to the dominant Jesuitism had reached a disagreeable height. When Pius IX., on 17th February, opened an exhibition of Christian art at Rome, he delivered a philippic against those who made themselves guilty of "the blasphemy" of wishing a 1789 for the Church. Nobody could be in any doubt that this speech was directed against the minority. L. Veuillot had long ago imputed this wish to the Liberal Catholics in France;³ and when he read the above-mentioned article in the *Moniteur*, he was convinced that the minority wished "an '89 for the Church."⁴

As early as 14th January, a scheme for the introduction of a little catechism was circulated.⁵ When it came to the first reading on 10th February, the opposers of Infallibility

¹ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1576.

² Letter from Vienna of 13th February in *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 16th February.

³ Friedrich III, 2, 640f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2, 645f.

⁵ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 663f.

gave vent to their uneasy feeling; for the little catechism was to be a vehicle for introducing Infallibility everywhere. By means of Deharbe's catechism a propaganda for the new dogma had for a long time past been quietly carried on both in Germany and in other places.¹ Mathieu, Rauscher² and many others at once expressed themselves against the scheme put forward, and Dupanloup declared that the civilised nations of Europe would not allow Rome to dictate to them a catechism. But most of the members of the Council had lost their interest in small questions, and were preparing themselves to meet the great one. Nevertheless, passions were stirred. Archbishop Haynald, of Colocza, was obliged to leave the rostrum on 22nd February, because he dared to say that the discord in the Church sprang out of the demand for these new dogmas. At these words a fearful noise arose. The right reverend members of the assembly banged the tables, and stamped with their feet, and Cardinal Capalti, the Vice-President, who considered that the President, Cardinal de Angelis, was too lenient, shouted in anger: *Taceas et descendas* (Hold your tongue and come down).³ The scheme for the little catechism had, however, to be returned like the other schemes, to the committee which it concerned.⁴ But the President thereupon informed the Council that the Pope had determined upon a new order of procedure, which was immediately read.⁵

The earlier order of business had certainly not shown itself fitted to further the work of the Council, but the new one threatened its liberty. It ordained that the members, instead of making speeches, were within a certain period of time, to send in writing their objections to the proposals laid before them. The committee was then to examine these remarks, revise the proposals in view of them, and, on bringing them forward again in their revised form, to explain the objections which had been alleged. The real discussion was only to begin after this preliminary work, and the debate could be

¹ Cp. Cl. Schmitz: *Ist der Papst persönlich unfehlbar* (Munich 1870).

² Wolfsgruber: *Card. Rauscher*, 431.

³ Darboy: *La Liberté au Concile* in Friedrich: *Documenta* I, 164f.

⁴ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 728.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 67f.

stopped if the majority of the assembly voted for the closure. It was also permitted at the last vote in the joint sittings to give a qualified Aye (*placet juxta modum*). The person concerned was in such a case only to give in writing his reasons for the position adopted, in order that regard might be paid to his difficulties before the public meeting, at which the voting must be only Aye or No.

The new order of procedure was a step in advance, in so far as it shortened the debates, which tired everybody;¹ but the alterations were especially aimed against the minority, who were accused of spinning matters out until the heat of summer should put a stop to all debates. As soon as it was produced it met with opposition. A party of French bishops, under the leadership of Dupanloup, drew up a memorial (*Ani-madversiones*) against the new order,² and 100 prelates of all nations joined in it. The opposition, in spite of all internal divergences, were at one in condemning that point in the new order of business, which made it possible to pass decrees by a simple majority of votes, instead of requiring moral unanimity. Certain Hungarian bishops even had the idea of adding an appendix, declaring that the authority and validity of the Council depended upon this point, and said that they would take no further part in the assembly if Parliamentary methods were to be introduced into the Council.³ This threat was not made public, but it was no secret that some intended to go to such a length. A suggestion was made to endeavour to reach an agreement upon some minor points, and then to send the Council home until better times. But this the Jesuits would not have. They had clearly seen the weakness of the opposition, and they determined to stake everything upon a quick move.

They had obtained a useful means of agitation in a pamphlet on *The Papal Monarchy*,⁴ which the Abbot of Solesmes, Dom Guéranger, had sent to Rome at the end of January. The reasoning of the learned Benedictine can be shortly rendered as follows:—As a rule, the Church is governed by the Pope; the Councils are an exception. They have at

¹ Bishop Pie complains of "the endless speeches." Baunard II, 385.

² Friedberg, 417f.

³ Acton, 85.

⁴ *De la monarchie pontificale à propos du livre de Mgr. l'Evêque de Sura.*

certain times undeniably been of service, but they have never been necessary, except when there was no pope. Jesus Christ instituted the Pope, but the Councils do not originate from Him. From the first inception of the Church, the popes have of their own sovereign authority formed decisions in matters of faith, and the doctrines against which they have declared themselves have always been considered as lawfully anathematised, and nobody has dared to make objection to the competence of the supreme judge. The existence of Gallicanism, according to Dom Guéranger, proves nothing to the contrary; because three Popes have condemned the declaration of 1682. The Council of Constance also is of no significance in this connexion; for it was not an Ecumenical Council. The assertion that Infallibility is something new is incorrect; the definition of it will really be only a theological deduction from the decrees of Lyons and Florence. And it will not cause consciences to be uneasy, for Catholic piety at the present day bears the impress of reverence for the Pope.

Mgr. Pie said in his funeral sermon on Dom Guéranger, that this pamphlet, which was chiefly intended to be a refutation of Maret, had dissipated the last clouds which overhung the Council, and Cardinal Pitra told the Prior of Solesmes, Dom Couturier, that members of the Council simply fought for the first three or four copies of the book which came to Rome.¹ On 12th March Pius IX. sent Dom Guéranger a letter of thanks, which is most eloquent, and in which indignation against the opponents of Infallibility finds utterance. It made it clear to everybody that the Pope had now entirely adopted the schemes of the Jesuits, which drew nearer and nearer to their realisation.

On 6th March there was sent to the members of the Council, who at that time were not holding joint sittings, because the committees were working on the schemes, an article² supplementary to the decree concerning the Roman primacy in the scheme "of the Church."³ It read thus: "We therefore teach with the approval of the Sacred Council, and ordain that it shall be an article of faith, . . . that the Roman

¹ F. Cabrol: *Histoire du Cardinal Pitra*, 284.

² *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 641.

³ See p. 336.

Pontiff cannot err . . . when, in the exercise of his office as the supreme teacher of all Christians, he determines by his authority what the whole Church is to hold in matters concerning faith and morals; and that this prerogative of inerrancy and Infallibility is co-extensive with the infallibility of the Church." This supplementary article bore a heading which described it as being to the effect "that the Pope of Rome cannot err in the definition of questions that concern faith and morals." It was accompanied by a *Monitum* from the secretary of the Council, announcing that very many (*plurimi*) of the bishops had prayed the Pope to bring Infallibility before the Council, and in accordance with the new order of procedure it requested the members to send in their observations to the secretary before 17th March.¹

This supplementary article revealed the aim of the Jesuits, and Pius IX. lost no opportunity of showing his sympathy with the Jesuit policy in the Council. After the death of Montalembert he went so far as to say in the presence of over 300 persons: "Montalembert was a Liberal Catholic, that is to say, a half-Catholic . . . yes, Liberal Catholics are only half Catholics."² But in spite of the weight that on all occasions he personally put into the scale, remonstrances against the new dogma could not be silenced. Döllinger, Dupanloup, Rauscher, the American Bishop Kenrick, and Newman, came forward with fresh observations, partly to show the nature of the new method of procedure, partly to prevent the definition of the dogma, and Bishop Hefele undertook to prove that Pope Honorius I. (died 638) had been heretical, and accordingly not infallible. In a Lenten sermon at Orléans the preacher, Charles Perraud,³ even spoke so violently against the Infallibility that Dupanloup's vicar-general did not dare to give permission for the printing of the sermon.⁴ But the more strongly the opposition to the intended dogma was expressed, the more strongly did the Jesuits with their peculiar logic insist that it was necessary to proclaim the dogma in order to kill the opposition.

¹ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 729.

² *Wie es auf dem Concil zugeht*, 195.

³ [Brother to the late Cardinal Bishop of Autun.]

⁴ Maynard, 267.

But at the end of February the diplomatists again began to move. On 20th February Count Daru, with the sanction of the Emperor, but without the knowledge of his colleagues, sent a fresh despatch to the Marquis de Banneville, which declared that the scheme "concerning the Church" would give to the Church supreme power over the commonwealth, and make the infallible Papacy paramount over all political and civil rights. The French Foreign Secretary appealed, therefore, in the Emperor's name, to the wisdom and loyalty of the papal government, and concluded by asking that his remarks might be laid before the assembled bishops.¹ This despatch was stopped and somewhat altered before it came into the hands of the papal Secretary of State. As soon as Count Daru's colleagues became acquainted with its contents, they raised objections to certain expressions, and the whole document was made the object of a critical review, by Ollivier especially, which resulted in several expressions being toned down.² After this, the despatch, bearing the original date, was delivered to Antonelli. But behind the back of his colleague Ollivier, through Mermillod, gave both the Secretary of State and Manning to understand that there was no need for Rome to fear "any serious step." Ollivier's action was not concealed from Daru, and it caused a conflict between the two ministers. A breach, however, was for the moment prevented. "I got more careful," writes Ollivier, "but the division remained, only a little more concealed." The dissension in the French ministry, which was well known at Rome, took the whole sting out of Daru's note, and Antonelli in his answer rode the high horse. He pretended to be greatly surprised that the simple declaration of principle in the scheme "concerning the Church" could have made such a sensation. But there could, of course, be no possibility of withdrawing it.³

Although this diplomatic intervention had been somewhat more disagreeable to the Vatican than the former notes, it did

¹ See *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1553f.

² The despatch was, according to Ollivier, "émondée, édulcorée, énermée." Ollivier II, 126.

³ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1555f. "Cette dépêche," writes Ollivier II, 198, "aggravait, au lieu de l'atténuer, la signification du schema de *Ecclesia*."

the minority no good. An effective intervention by France, so long as Ollivier was at the helm, was so remote a contingency, that the Vatican, for the moment, did not need to reckon with it. The French minister did what he could to bring the Emperor over to his side. He even fetched Guizot to the Tuileries, in order that the old Protestant statesman, who was opposed to the principle of intervention, might support his policy with regard to the Council. During the audience the Emperor turned the conversation to the Council and the burning question of intervention or non-intervention, whereupon Guizot answered: "There are difficulties which only exist when we ourselves discover them. Here we ought not to find them." "You are right," answered Napoleon III.; and Ollivier rejoiced that the Emperor had received a new impetus in the direction of non-intervention.¹ Count Daru, however, did not rest idle. He proposed that the European cabinets should be represented at the Council; but from Berlin, Vienna, and Florence alike, came polite rejections of his proposal.

Antonelli's reply to the despatch of 20th February could not remain unanswered; and the different parties in the Council therefore began again to bestir themselves in order to influence opinion in leading circles at the French capital. Bishop Laouënan of Pondicherry was to be the spokesman of the majority; the minority had various advocates; and the middle party, which was led by Cardinal Bonnechose, sent Forcade, Bishop of Nevers. Finally, the government called the Marquis de Banneville home in order to obtain trustworthy information about everything.

At the Vatican they relied mainly upon Ollivier. The Pope had said to the Bishop of Pondicherry that the French minister was "very religious," and he expected that Ollivier, when facts had entirely dispersed the dreams of his youth, would give up the idea of a separation between State and Church, which, according to Pius IX.'s view, was as impious as the idea of separating the human and divine natures in Christ. Through the Bishop of Pondicherry, the majority attempted to reassure the French government. The State, so it was affirmed in this quarter, had no reason whatever to be anxious about "purely theoretical

¹ Ollivier II, 137.

declarations," so much the less so, because obedience to the laws was the first commandment for a Catholic. The dissension at the Council was, from the point of view of the majority, represented as a strife between the Papacy and the episcopate, which would not surrender its power over the inferior clergy, who sided with Rome; and all assertions about the want of liberty at the Council and all threats of a schism were denied as products of a too lively imagination. The representatives of the minority made themselves not only the spokesmen of these assertions and menaces, but they maintained also that the Church with which France had concluded its Concordat would no longer exist if the designs of the majority were carried into effect; and they likewise asserted that the independence, honour, and peace of the nation would be threatened if the Jesuit church policy gained the victory. They therefore wished for an intervention, preferably introduced by an interpellation in the Chamber which could be wound up with an order of the day. Finally, the middle party uttered warnings both against the indiscretion of the majority and against the challenges flung out by the minority, and they proposed that out of their party a prelate should be chosen who should bear the ancient title of *protecteur de la couronne de France*.¹

After hearing the proposals of the different parties, the French ministry agreed to draw up a memorandum,² insisting on the misgivings expressed in Daru's despatch of 20th February; but at the same time the Cabinet determined to continue to treat the question of Infallibility as *une controverse de l'ordre spirituel*. Shortly beforehand, Visconti Venosta had declared in the Italian Parliament that Italy, as hitherto, would maintain a passive attitude.³ Austria, Prussia, and Bavaria, on the other hand, were ready to follow France, provided only that the French government would give up the idea of sending a special ambassador to the Council.⁴

Before the memorandum was delivered at the Vatican, Mgr. Forcade returned to Rome to reconnoitre the position. Antonelli immediately declared that he was unwilling to communicate the utterances of the French government to the

¹ Ollivier II, 201f.

² *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1563f.

³ *Ibid.*, 1593f.

⁴ Ollivier II, 210.

Council, out of regard, so he said, for the other powers. Two days after, on 7th April, Pius IX. also personally dismissed the idea of laying the French despatches before the Council, but he listened willingly to the private suggestion of Mgr. Forcade to postpone for the present the discussion of questions which created disturbances in the Assembly, so that the hot season might be reached in peace. The heat would then make a postponement until November necessary, and by that time people's minds might have settled down. According to Mgr. Forcade's opinion, an impression was also made upon Pius IX. when the French bishop pointed out to him the difficulties which might arise for the French government and the Emperor if the questions referred to were debated at once.¹

The French *chargé d'affaires*, who took care of official matters during De Banneville's absence, did not form so favourable an impression of the temper of the Vatican as Mgr. Forcade, and when the Marquis de Banneville returned to Rome and presented the French memorandum (22nd April), Pius IX. declared that it was impossible to submit such documents to the Council. The French ambassador seemed also, during the audience, to feel that the Pope was far more occupied with the situation in Germany, where the continued criticism, and various indiscretions in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* in particular, had caused fresh anxiety and annoyance at the Vatican.²

The French memorandum had immediately found adhesion from other governments. On 10th April Count Beust wrote to Trautmannsdorff, that it was an expression of the views held also by the Austrian government, and he requested the Austrian ambassador to urge the opinions expressed in it *avec empressement*.³ Similar support was received from Bavaria (where De Bray had succeeded Prince Hohenlohe as President), from Spain, Portugal, and England.⁴ The North German League also joined France in this matter, and Count Arnim went still further in a despatch of 23rd April, in which he recommended

¹ Mgr. Forcade's letter in Ollivier II, 214f.

² Ollivier II, 219f.

³ The despatch in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1585f.

⁴ Odo Russell did what he could to keep the English government from any interference or pressure on the Council. See his letter of 8th April in Purcell: *Manning* II, 445.

the French memorandum to the benevolent consideration of the Vatican. He reminded the Vatican that the German bishops according to certain published documents, which must be considered authentic, had been of opinion that it was their duty to point out beforehand what deplorable consequences it might have, if, "without paying any regard to an important minority," certain decrees were allowed to be passed, which in the shape of dogmatic definitions would introduce far-reaching changes with regard to the authority due to the various grades of the hierarchy, and at the same time disturb the mutual relations between the secular and the ecclesiastical powers.¹

Before this despatch was written, a partial change had taken place in the French ministry. On 11th April, Count Daru resigned, and Ollivier had temporarily taken his place as Foreign Minister.² The telegraphic announcement was immediately sent to Rome: "Daru is retiring, Ollivier takes his place; the Council has its liberty." Ultramontanism indulged in the highest hopes. The plebiscite was coming on in France, and Louis Veuillot and his friends hoped to be able to exercise an influence on the ministry in regard to the Roman question, by promising to vote with the government in their home policy. That party now would not be content with anything less than a promise on the part of France never to recall her troops from Rome. The French government, of course, neither could nor would give such a promise, and least of all at a moment when the official organ of Jesuitism and the Vatican, the *Osservatore Romano*, was affirming, that "France would only find rest and happiness when it reintroduced personal rule in the State and personal infallibility in the Church."³ An out-and-out sanction of the ideas of Joseph de Maistre was more than could be expected of a Liberal ministry; but when the demand was refused, French Ultramontanism gave out that it was aggrieved. The *Univers* declared that it was best for the friends of the paper to abstain from voting for the plebiscite, since the government would give no guarantee whatever. Many other French Catholics took up the same attitude, because, like Daru, they wished that much

¹ The despatch in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 1602f.

² Ollivier II, 225.

³ *Ibid.*, 228.

stronger pressure should be brought to bear upon the Council than had been done in the memorandum. It was, in fact, as Ollivier openly confesses,¹ a very weak document, and one which lacked the proper relation between premises and conclusion. After the many objections raised in the opening clauses, it might have been expected to end with a threat of recalling the French troops. But Ollivier would on no account agree to such a step. His growing influence in the Cabinet was a great comfort to the French ultramontane bishops, and most of them informed the Marquis de Banneville that they had impressed upon their vicars-general to use their influence to obtain as many votes as possible for the plebiscite.

Meanwhile, under these occasionally exciting circumstances, when the centre of gravity of the Council seemed to be shifted from the Vatican to the Tuileries, the discussion was continued in the *aula* of St Peter's. On 18th March, the scheme "of the faith" was again presented, but in a much altered form.² Nevertheless, it met with opposition. Bishop Strossmayer, on 22nd March, delivered a splendid speech, in which he defended Protestantism against the accusation contained in the introduction to the scheme, that it was the origin of Rationalism.³ "With the permission of the right reverend Lords," he began, "be it said that this judgment seems to me to be consistent neither with truth nor with charity. Not with truth, for although the Protestants have certainly been guilty of a great offence . . . yet the germ of Rationalism lay already in the so-called Humanism or Classicism. . . . Add to this that contempt for the faith and for religion originated at the beginning of the eighteenth century, without any connexion with Protestantism, in a Catholic nation, at the time of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists." The speaker next dwelt upon Leibnitz and his efforts to unite the various religious confessions, but he was interrupted by the cries of the assembly, and the President, Cardinal de Angelis, rang the bell and said: "This is not the place to praise the Protestants." But Strossmayer continued to speak, and maintained that there were a great many people in Germany, England, and America, who erred in good faith. Upon this ensued a fresh interruption.

¹ Ollivier II, 212.

² *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 8of.

³ *Ibid.*, 70.

"Shame, shame, down with the heretic," was heard from various sides. But Strossmayer did not allow himself to be stopped by the shouts of the angry fathers; he even ventured to begin a criticism of the order of procedure, especially of the principle that a majority of votes was sufficient to create decrees. He said: "This Council lacks both liberty and truth." And he concluded with the following protest: "A Council which disregards the old rule of the necessity of moral unanimity, and begins to decide propositions which concern faith and morals by a majority of votes, will, according to my inmost conviction, forfeit the right to bind the conscience of the Catholic world on condition of eternal life and death."¹

This was too much for the assembly; there was fresh howling and shouting, and the President stopped Strossmayer from speaking. But on the following day the courageous Bishop of Diakovar sent in a protest in writing, which was approved by the Germans and several other bishops. It contained a demand for a plain answer to the question, how far moral unanimity was necessary or not. "If a plain answer be not given to this," Strossmayer concluded, "then I am face to face with the question, whether I can remain in a Council where the liberty of the bishops is suppressed, and where dogmas are to be defined in a new manner, and one hitherto unknown in the Church of God."

The Jesuits did not much mind Strossmayer, but still, remarkably enough, the charge against Protestantism was considerably softened at the next sitting.² As soon as Count Arnim received news of the affair, he had immediately telegraphed to Bismarck, and had at once received the answer that he was to break off diplomatic communications with Rome, if the sentence mentioned were not cancelled. Antonelli, who, as a Neapolitan journal said, was accustomed to save himself in his relations with France by polite bows, perceived that there was danger ahead when Prussia came forward with moustachios and Wellington boots. He therefore swallowed the bitter pill, and requested that the accusation against the Protestants should be omitted.³ As some

¹ Acton, 87f.

² See the two different forms in *Officielle Aktenstücke* II, 129f.

³ K. Hase: *Polemik*, 40f. Cp. also his *Annalen meines Lebens*, 216f.

other points also had been modified, especially at the end of the decree, where a fresh attempt had been made to prepare the way for Infallibility, the opposition assented. On the Sunday after Easter (24th April), a public session was held, in which the scheme concerning the faith was unanimously passed by 667 members. Strossmayer preferred to stay at home that day. It was Schwarzenberg who succeeded in getting the greater part of the opposition to assent. He thought he was acting prudently in advising the members to reserve their opposition for a more essential point; but he did irreparable harm by this policy. The opposition had been induced to abandon a main point, namely, the necessity of moral unanimity; and the Jesuits had cleverly obtained the passing of a decree by means of the order of procedure, which the opposition had so strongly criticised. Besides, the concluding portion of the decree itself was very perilous. It reminded everyone of the duty of obeying the papal decrees, including those in which the Holy See condemns wrong opinions which are not enumerated in the decree itself.¹ It was a prelude to the proclamation of the dogma of Infallibility, and what was the use of assuring the opposition that no new force was to be given to the decisions of Rome, and that everything was to be as before?² The dogma which could overcome history could easily get over a few vague promises. There was great joy, therefore, in the ultramontane camp. The famous archæologist, De Rossi, remarked to Mgr. Pie: "Even if the Council were to accomplish no more than this, it would be a great Council."³

On the same day that the constitution "of the faith" was adopted, Manning, Mermillod, and the recently consecrated Bishop Freppel of Angers,⁴ with some other bishops of the majority, presented to Pius IX. an address, in which they requested that the scheme concerning Infallibility might be laid before the Council "without delay," in order that the mind

¹ "Omnes officii monemus servandi etiam Constitutiones et Decreta, quibus pravæ ejusmodi opiniones, quæ isthic diserte non enumerantur, ab hac S. Sede proscriptæ et prohibitæ sunt." *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 256.

² Quirinus, 435f. Cp. Acton, 94f.

³ Baunard: *Histoire du Cardinal Pie* II, 383.

⁴ He was present for the first time at the Council on that day. Cornut: *Mgr. Freppel*, 160.

of Christians might no longer be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, and that the evil which had already become too great might not become incurable.¹ Mgr. Pie and other equally ultramontane prelates had not signed this address, because they considered impatient zeal for the proclamation of the new dogma to be "a breach of logical order in the work of the Council."² There were several, however, who had special reasons for this great haste. Many divined that a war was imminent. A war would break up the Council, and when it had once been dispersed, the prospect of its reassembling would be remote.³ It was important, therefore, to act quickly.

The misgivings of Prussia as to the new dogma, which have been mentioned above, were undoubtedly due in part to the impending conflict. At Berlin the concord between the Curia, the Jesuits, and the French government, was regarded with a certain uneasiness.⁴ But politics had not yet brought the Christian brotherliness of the members of the Council into collision with their love of country. As Dupanloup could not expect help from his own government, he applied, without hesitation, to the Prussian minister, Count Arnim, and asked him to seek an audience at the Vatican, and get Pius IX. to adjourn the meetings of the Council. The Bishop of Orléans, incredible as it sounds, must still have believed in the myth of the kind old Pope, who was a half-unwilling instrument in the hands of Jesuit fanatics; but Count Arnim was wiser. He felt his way with Antonelli; and after the experience gained on that occasion, he had no inclination to proceed further. "We have made fools of ourselves," said one of the diplomatists at that time, as his main impression of the action of diplomacy;⁵ and this judgment will scarcely meet with serious contradiction from those who have read through the documents relating to the time.

As Count Arnim would not go under fire, Dupanloup determined to do so himself. On 26th April he sent

¹ The address with the signatures in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 977f.

² Cp. Pie's statements in Baunard II, 395f.

³ Friedrich III, 2, 871.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 872.

⁵ Friedrich: *Tagebuch*, 371.

Pius IX. a letter,¹ in which he besought the Pope to spare the Church and the Holy See disasters which might be fatal to Christianity. This letter scarcely made any impression on Pius IX.; but he became somewhat anxious when Cardinal Bilio and a number of Italian cardinals, amongst others Pecci (Leo XIII.), begged him to delay the Infallibility until the new dogma could come in its right place in the scheme concerning the Church.² But the Jesuits easily overcame his scruples, and on 2nd May, in a letter to Dupanloup, he asked "his venerable brother" to be calm, and to trust that the Holy Ghost in a General Council would illuminate minds and guide wills, so that nothing should be done which should not be done.³

In the meantime, however, the scheme concerning the short catechism was laid before the Council in an altered form⁴ on 25th April, the day after the constitution "of the faith" had been adopted. The debates on it commenced on 29th April. The first but one who had asked to speak was Cardinal Rauscher of Vienna, but as illness prevented the venerable prelate from speaking himself, he got his speech read by Bishop Hefele.⁵ Rauscher asserted that a catechism ought to be in accord with the degree of education and the special needs of a people and of a certain period; it was, therefore, unreasonable to wish for the same catechism everywhere. How far a catechism like the one proposed could be used in Spain and North America, the Cardinal of Vienna did not know, but he had a right to say that it would not be serviceable for Austria; he even feared that its introduction would make the Austrian government exclude religious instruction from the Austrian schools. When the name of Joseph II. was mentioned in this connexion—even though with disapproval—a murmuring was heard in the *aula*; and when Hefele read the end of the speech, in which Rauscher expressed the hope that the new Catechism would only be recommended

¹ Baunard: *Histoire du Cardinal Pie II*, 398. Cp. Lagrange: *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup III*, 155f.

² Ollivier II, 258.

³ Baunard II, 399. This letter will not be found in Lagrange.

⁴ *Collectio Lacensis VII*, 664f. The secretary's letter, *ibid.*, 740.

⁵ Wolfsgruber: *Cardinal Rauscher*, 431.

and not enjoined, the assembly began to laugh loudly. Hefele became angry at this and complained to the president, who consoled him by saying that the fathers at Trent had experienced similar scenes. But this only afforded the Bishop of Rottenburg an opportunity of remarking that such spectacles might very easily lead to doubts both as to the liberty and as to the ecumenical character of the Council.

After Hefele's speech the discussion was stopped for a while by Cardinal de Angelis, who informed the assembly, to the dismay of the minority, that Pius IX., after repeated solicitations from many bishops, had determined very soon to set before them a scheme concerning the Pope of Rome, which was to contain the doctrine of his primacy and infallibility.¹ This communication made a deep impression on the whole assembly, and all interest in the little Catechism vanished at once. Nevertheless, the remaining part of the debate on the Catechism was not a little passionate, because both sides were loaded with shot to be used in the great battle. The majority had attacked Bossuet's Catechism; but the Archbishop of Avignon took the liberty of not only defending Bossuet, but also of speaking with great appreciation of Napoleon I. and the French Concordat. Several joined in his criticism of the scheme, and the ill-will towards it was still so great that it had to be sent back again to the committee to receive fresh corrections.

On the same day that Pius IX. replied to Dupanloup's warning, Darboy wrote a letter to his Emperor, which was found, after the fall of the Empire, in the Tuileries. Between the lines may be read his regret, that the minority could only expect so little active support from the French government, and Darboy reserves to himself to give the Emperor afterwards a survey of the situation, as soon as the formula in question should be in his hands. The minority had lost some members by illness, departure, and death, "but," writes the Archbishop, "it will do its best, and it has not yet given up the hope of victory."² Shortly afterwards, he wrote also a letter to Antonelli, warning him against forcing a hasty adoption of

¹ De Angelis's speech in *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 740.

² R. Halt: *Papiers sauvés des Tuileries* (Paris 1871), 78f.

Infallibility;¹ and on 8th May sixty-nine of the bishops of the minority sent in a protest against altering the order of the discussions by placing the Primacy and the Infallibility in the foreground, and by removing these doctrines from their natural place in connexion with the teaching about the Church. Throughout the protest sounds a bitter complaint that the Pope by so many letters and declarations should seem to place the definition of Infallibility first; and it winds up with a threat. "It is no longer compatible," the writers say, "with our episcopal dignity, with our duty at the Council and with our rights as members of it, to send in petitions, since experience has taught us more than sufficiently that there is no intention of paying any regard to our petitions, nor even of vouchsafing us an answer. We have therefore no alternative but to remonstrate and to protest against this method of transacting business, which, in our opinion, is most pernicious (*perniciossimum*) both for the Church and for the Holy See, so that we, for our part, both before men and in view of the terrible judgment of God, may be freed from responsibility for those unhappy consequences which will soon occur, and indeed have already occurred."²

At this juncture there appeared a book called *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, printed by H. Plon at Paris,³ which contained a crushing criticism of the whole work of the Council, mostly based upon the representations of the *Univers* and other ultra-montane journals. This book was, of course, forbidden at Rome, but it was nevertheless in everybody's hands. This highly rhetorical work however did not frighten the Jesuits. Shortly afterwards, by command of the Curia, a work by Cardoni was distributed, which was supposed to prove Infallibility by tradition, Scripture, and reason. After it was published, Margotti wrote a notice of it in the paper *Unità*, which revealed the confident assurance of the Infallibility party. "The work of the Holy Ghost," he writes, "is discernible; the opposition is diminishing daily. Cardoni has just published

¹ His "protestation contre le projet de précipiter la discussion" is printed in Quirinus, 854f.

² Friedrich: *Documenta* II, 392f.

³ Translated into German in *Stimmen aus der kath. Kirche* II. Cp. Friedrich: *Tagebuch*, 380.

his masterpiece on Infallibility, and everyone now understands that the Papal Infallibility is the only means of salvation and deliverance from the evils due to the liberty of the Press and to journalism. We must have a pope who is himself infallible, and who can every day teach, condemn, and define, without Catholics ever being allowed to doubt the oracles pronounced by him (*senza che mai sia licito ai cattolici dubitare de' suoi oracoli*).” The historical criticism of the new dogma, produced by Hefele and others, was, of course without the slightest importance in the eyes of Margotti’s partisans. In that camp they were at one with Manning, that the dogma must be able to overcome history, and indeed had already overcome it.

The Jesuits therefore proceeded without delay towards the real goal of the Council. On 9th May the “first dogmatical constitution concerning the Church of Christ,”¹ of which notice had been given, was distributed to the assembled fathers, and also a survey of the objections to the scheme regarding the primacy of the Pope.² The constitution concerning the Church of Christ was a revised form of the parallel portion of the earlier draft decree “of the Church,” and of the “supplementary article.”³ It was divided into four sections: (1) of the institution of the apostolic primacy in the person of Peter; (2) of the perpetuation of Peter’s primacy in the Roman popes; (3) of the power and nature of the Roman primacy; and (4) of the Infallibility of the Pope. In the last section the dogma of Infallibility was set forth in all its clearness.

On 13th May, the birthday of Pius IX., the debate on the new dogma was opened. It fell to Mgr. Pie, as a member of the dogmatic commission, to introduce the discussion, and he delivered a great speech, which roused the admiration of all the adherents of Infallibility. During the preparation of it he had had a conversation with Pius IX. in the gardens of the Vatican, and he had also long consultations with the Jesuits, Franzelin and Schrader.⁴ He began with an apology for bringing forward a scheme outside its proper setting; but in doing so he only followed the wish of all Catholic Christendom. It was in accordance with that wish that this subject was placed

¹ *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 269f.

² *Ibid.*, 274f.

³ See above, p. 336, 343.

⁴ Baunard: *Histoire du Cardinal Pie* II, 400f. Cp. Quirinus, 532.

upon the agenda for the day. The Infallibility in the fourth chapter of the constitution, according to Mgr. Pie's argument, was only a logical consequence of the other three chapters. He concluded with a comparison which gained the applause of the Italians and Spaniards beyond that of others. In the legend that St Peter was crucified with his head downwards, he saw fresh proof of the Infallibility; for the head of the Apostle then bore up the whole body and "thus the Pope, as the head, now bears the whole Church. But it is he who bears, that is infallible, not that which is borne." It is difficult not to write satire when touching upon "comparisons" of this kind. There was, however, a public to which they appealed, even amongst the bishops. Mermillod expressed his conviction that the new Hilary in a few words had succeeded in dispersing the Gallican and German mists, and on the day following Mgr. Pie was complimented by Pius IX. himself.

On 14th May the general debate upon the proposed constitution began. Manning delivered a speech of nearly two hours' duration which he had previously read aloud to an English bishop, and to the Jesuit Liberatore. Its object was to prove that the infallibility of the Head was a logical consequence of the infallibility of the body.¹ Dechamps in his speech called the opponents of the dogma "bad Christians," who do not walk in the fear of God. But Hefele, Schwarzenberg and Darboy² spoke boldly against the Infallibility. The first named also read a speech by Rauscher against the contemplated dogma, and Darboy again sent the Emperor a letter complaining of the obstinate Rome, which neither paid any regard to the despatch of 20th February, nor to the French memorandum.³ Cardinal Cullen from Ireland entered the lists against Hefele, especially with regard to the assertion of the heresy of Honorius I.; but another Irish prelate, the aged Archbishop MacHale of Tuam, who in O'Connell's days had been the champion of the Catholics in Ireland, spoke against Infallibility. Two powerful speakers stood up during the last meetings against the new dogma, Archbishop Connolly of Halifax, and Strossmayer.⁴ The first had come to Rome as

¹ Purcell II, 456.

² His speech in Friedrich: *Documenta* II, 415f.; in French in Ollivier II, 284f.

³ Ollivier II, 236f.

⁴ Quirinus, 595f.

an adherent of Infallibility; but a thorough investigation of the testimony in favour of it had converted him; both Holy Scripture and the most ancient traditions, to his mind, bore witness against it. Strossmayer made out that the new dogma was opposed to the constitution of the Church, opposed to the rights of the bishops and of the Councils, and opposed to the unchangeable rule of faith. In his eyes to sanction the new dogma would be the best means of destroying the Infallibility of the Church.

On 3rd June the general debate was closed to the surprise and horror of the opposition. Sixty-four speakers had been heard, but there were still forty on the list when the closure was asked for. Several were of opinion that the opposition bishops ought not to take any further part in the debate,¹ and about eighty members of that party assembled at Cardinal Rauscher's rooms in the Palazzo Lepri, in the Via Condotti, to take counsel in view of the situation. Strossmayer, Haynald, Darboy, Dupanloup, and Connolly of Halifax were disposed to remain in Rome without taking part in the discussions of the general congregation, and only to appear at the voting and say *Non placet*. Others were more inclined to join in a short protest against the closure of the general debate, a draft of which was laid before them by Rauscher. It was signed by eighty German and French bishops, headed by Schwarzenberg, Mathieu, Rauscher, and Darboy.²

As the heat at Rome was increasing day by day, Pius IX. received fresh appeals to adjourn the meetings; but he obstinately refused. "Since the days of Napoleon I., egotistic absolutism has nowhere in the Christian world appeared so undisguisedly and so recklessly," writes Quirinus indignantly on 18th June,³ when mentioning how bishops who were accustomed to quite another climate were compelled to stay at Rome in melting heat; they were not even allowed to make excursions without special permission. When the Prince Bishop of Breslau, Förster, at the end of May wished to go to Naples to recruit, he was stopped by the Roman police, because he could not produce a permit for the journey from the secretary

¹ Quirinus, 610f.

² Friedrich: *Documenta* II, 397f.

³ Quirinus, 658.

of the Council. Afterwards, Antonelli attempted to excuse the action of the police by saying that they had misunderstood the order, which was only intended to refer to the Oriental bishops; but, nevertheless, the Suffragan Bishop of Erlau in Hungary had the same experience as Förster. Antonelli then explained that the bishops had certainly permission to leave Rome temporarily, but they must not leave the Council.¹ It caused great indignation also that the keeper of the papal archives, Augustin Theiner, was dismissed from his post, because the Jesuits accused him of having abused his position. The opposition had appealed to the method of procedure at the Council of Trent as against the order which the Pope had now introduced. Pius IX., who suspected that the opponents of the dogma had received their information from Theiner, summoned him, and brusquely deprived him of the keys of the archives, which were thereupon given to Cardoni.²

On 6th June the special debate upon the proposed constitution began. It might have been expected that the protest of the eighty bishops would have been communicated to the Council; but this was not so. Officially, not a word was said about it; but a fortnight later there came an oral announcement that the president did not consider the protest in order, since the decree of 20th February had been carefully followed in closing the debate.³ The bishops, who spoke during the special debate, endeavoured to get the constitution altered in such a way that they might retain some of their former authority, and not sink down to be merely the obedient officials of the Pope, and courageous remonstrances against Infallibility were not wanting. Above all, the Dominican Cardinal Guidi, Archbishop of Bologna, must be mentioned.⁴ That former professor at the Roman university began by saying that the personal Infallibility of the Pope, apart from the episcopate, which the constitution sought to assert, was unknown in the Church till as late as the fourteenth century; he even quoted passages from Bellarmine and Perrone which were directly against it. This was too much for the majority. The partisans of

¹ His words in Quirinus, 537.

² H. Gisiger: *P. Theiner und die Jesuiten* (Mannheim 1875), 61f.

³ Friedrich: *Documenta* II, 399.

⁴ Quirinus, 671f. Pomponio Leto, 279f.

Infallibility began to make a noise and to abuse Guidi as a scoundrel (*birbante*) and a brigand (*brigantino*). But he would not be stopped. He brought the great saint and theologian of his order, Thomas Aquinas, into the field against the new dogma, and at last he put forward one or two very bold propositions which went quite against the Jesuit theory of Infallibility. On the afternoon of the same day Pius IX. sent for him. The angry Pope received him with the following words: "You are my enemy! You are the coryphæus of the opposition, and ungrateful! You have taught heretical doctrines!" When Guidi defended himself by appealing to tradition, Pius IX., like an ecclesiastical Louis XIV., replied, "I am tradition" (*La tradizione son' io*). The Pope then reproached the Archbishop of Bologna for having allowed himself to be embraced by Strossmayer, and he accused him of having spoken with a view to winning the favour of the Liberals, the revolution, and the government at Florence. Guidi took his leave with the dry words: "Holy Father, have the kindness to read my speech!" The conduct of the Cardinal of Bologna was the sole subject of conversation, and, says Pomponio Leto, there rained upon his sinful head the heaviest curses "from those whose business it was to teach others to follow the words of St John: 'Little children, love one another.'"

Meanwhile the last hour of the Council was approaching, and the excitement grew from day to day. Pius IX. had hoped to be able to proclaim the Infallibility on 29th June, the day of St Peter and St Paul, but it proved to be impossible. The frustrated hope filled him with bitterness; and he continued to be inaccessible to all representations with regard to postponing the sessions, although not a few of the members fell ill in the stifling heat. "Just let them die" (*che crepino pure*), Pius IX. is even reported to have said in his anger at the opposition which he could not break. And Antonelli blamed the bishops themselves for the disagreeable stay in Rome during the hot season; there was no need for them to have wasted so much time in superfluous talking.¹ Several, however, obtained permission to go home,² and those who stayed were more and

¹ Friedrich III, 2, 1137. Quirinus, 743.

² Pomponio Leto, 291.

more bent upon making an end of it. The Hungarian bishops had agreed that none of them would speak any more; and the Austrian and German bishops were preparing to make a similar agreement. The spokesman of the majority, Canossa, Bishop of Verona, addressed himself accordingly to Haynald, and asked him to use his efforts to promote a compact that both sides should refrain from speaking. When Dupanloup heard it, he was furious, and ran to Haynald, whom he assailed with hard words, and called him "a betrayer of the truth." The Archbishop of Colocza took his rudeness with an air of great superiority, and merely said: "My dear Lord, let us not speak of that now." On the following day Dupanloup perceived that he had made a mistake, and begged Haynald's pardon.¹

Before the debate came to an end, however, the Council had to hear a great speech on 1st July from the Spanish bishop, Payá y Rico of Cuenza, who wished to strike a last blow for Infallibility. When Payá y Rico had finished, he received kisses and embraces from the members of the majority sitting nearest to him, and Pius IX. immediately sent him his apostolic blessing, accompanied by a wish to see him soon. Maret, Greith of St Gall, and a few other bishops replied; but before the sun set, the German and Austrian bishops had finally agreed to refrain from speaking. Two days after, the Frenchmen also arrived at the conclusion that it was better to be silent than to prolong the debate. Payá y Rico fancied in his simplicity that the minority were silent, because they were overwhelmed by his eloquence.²

On the day after the French had agreed to abstain from speaking (4th July), a member of the Council received a telegram from Paris which said: "Hold out for a few days; Providence is sending you an unexpected help."³ This help was the Franco-German war, the outbreak of which was perceived to be near at hand by those initiated in politics. The telegram came a day too late; both the majority and the minority were now unanimous in wishing to finish. Once more, however, passions flared up in the council hall, when an attempt was made, during the revision of the canons which have been mentioned,⁴ to

¹ Ollivier II, 329.

² Friedrich III, 2, 1143f.

³ Baunard II, 411f.

⁴ See p. 333.

interpolate a sentence which would give the Papacy absolute power at the expense of the episcopate.¹ Most people had not noticed the alteration, but Darboy rose and declared that such a canon could not be sanctioned without discussion. It thus became evident that an unworthy surprise had been intended, and several of the bishops wished immediately to leave the hall. The presidents grew uneasy, and in order to allay the indignation they were obliged to postpone the vote on this canon, and to promise that it should be printed and distributed before the final vote was taken. Great was the excitement at the private meetings of the bishops over this "juggling trick," and the French bishops proposed to leave Rome. But they contented themselves with signing a protest, which, of course, did no more good than any of the former ones.²

On 12th July the minority held a well attended meeting, and after a proposal of mediation on the part of Bishop Ketteler had been rejected, Cardinal Schwarzenberg said that he would be glad if another cardinal would vote before him against the third and fourth sections of the scheme concerning the Pope's Primacy, which was to be proposed the next day; otherwise he would himself be the first to say: *Non placet*.

Amidst the greatest tension, 601 of the 692 prelates who were assembled at Rome met in the *aula* on 13th July. At the voting upon the whole scheme concerning the Primacy, 451 voted *Placet*, 62 *Placet juxta modum*, and 88 *Non placet*. Amongst these last were Schwarzenberg, Rauscher, Mathieu, MacHale, Connolly, Darboy, Dupanloup, Maret, Haynald, Strossmayer, Förster, and Hefe. In order to estimate rightly the value of these numbers it must first be borne in mind that the absent members were by no means all opposed to the dogma; most of them had remained at home on account of sickness. Then it must not be presumed that all those who voted a conditional *Placet* agreed with the minority; there were, however incredible it may sound, some bishops, who did not consider the scheme sufficiently absolute. The actual proportion between the parties was that the majority was five times as large as the minority; but if the votes could be weighed, the proportions would assuredly be quite different.

¹ Friedrich III, 2, 1159f.

² Quirinus, 788f.

In order to avert the threatening danger, and to avoid an ecclesiastical scandal, the minority determined to make a last appeal to Pius IX. On Friday, 15th July, at eight o'clock in the evening, the Primate of Hungary, Archbishop Simor, accompanied by Darboy, Ketteler, Scherr of Munich, and Rivet of Dijon, went up to the Vatican as the representatives of the minority, to make a last offer of peace, and to intimate the course the opposition would take if the Pope were inexorable.¹ The deputation was ushered in at nine o'clock. When Pius IX. asked what the five bishops wanted, Darboy as their spokesman answered that they wished to ask the Pope to omit the last addition made to one of the canons in the third chapter, and to insert the words, *innixus testimonio ecclesiarum* (based upon the testimony of the churches), or something similar, in the section about the Infallibility.² Pius IX. answered: "I will do what I can, but I have not yet read the scheme, and do not know what it contains. Besides, this question concerns the Council, not me; a petition such as this must therefore be addressed to the Council." Thereupon he asked Darboy to formulate the wish of the minority in writing. Darboy promised to do so, but he added that he would also take the liberty of sending the Pope the scheme. Then Pius IX. asked: "How many *Non placets* will be changed into *Placets*, if the suggested addition be made?" "We, and those who have sent us," answered the five bishops, "will certainly say *Placet*." "How many are you?" "Eighty." "But there were eighty-eight who voted *Non placet*," said the Pope; if they could procure 100 *Placets*, he would without hesitation agree to their amendment. Then Ketteler sprang forward, threw himself on his knees before Pius IX., and begged him with tears to restore peace and the lost unity to the Church and the episcopate. Pius IX. was moved by seeing the proud bishop of the see of St Boniface at his feet, and the representatives of the minority returned in good hope. Immediately upon their return, Darboy wrote down the wishes of the opposi-

¹ Concerning the audience, see Scherr's own account in Friedrich, 389f. Quirinus, 800f., and Foulon: *Darboy*, 463f.

² Maynard (in the often quoted book, p. 276) says of this wish that the formula would introduce a Gallicanism "worse than Bossuet's," and open the door for insurmountable difficulties.

tion,¹ and they were sent to the Pope on the following morning. But when the majority heard of the action of the minority, they also sent a deputation to Pius IX ; amongst others, Senestrey of Regensburg was a member of it. It represented to the hesitating Pope that everything was in order, and that the majority was enthusiastic for the dogma in its most extreme form. At the same time the deputation frightened him by saying that if he gave way he would go down to history like another Honorius.² This made an impression upon Pius IX., and he told the representatives of the minority that it was the business of the Council to decide the matter in question ; he would not personally interfere otherwise than to examine the constitution before he gave his assent to it. When Cardinal Rauscher later in the day had an interview with the Pope, in order to thank him for his gracious reception of the deputation from the minority, he remarked the change. He explained what distressing results might follow, if the majority's proposal were carried through ; but he received the answer : "It is too late ; the formula is already circulated, and the meeting for its adoption fixed. It is impossible to gratify the minority."³

So on 16th July the general congregation was held, in which the dogma of Infallibility was to be prepared for final adoption. It was necessary to complete the work of the Council as quickly as possible, because war was at the point of being declared. The meeting was opened with an address by the Neapolitan D'Avanzo, Bishop of Calvi and Teano, who, with an allusion to Revelation x. 9, asserted that it was necessary now to "swallow" the dogma of Infallibility, as the Seer in the apocalyptic vision had been obliged to swallow the book there mentioned. This dogma, said the Neapolitan bishop, would perhaps, like that book, cause the belly pain, but to the mouth it would also be sweet as honey.⁴ Then Bishop Gasser of Brixen ascended the rostrum. He declared that Councils hitherto had only been necessary for people

¹ Besides the addition given above he proposed the formulæ : "et mediis, quæ semper in Ecclesia catholica usurpata fuere, adhibitis" or "non exclusis Episcopis." *Collectio Lacensis*, 992f ; Foulon, 464.

² Friedrich : *Tagebuch*, 390. Quirinus, 803f. Ollivier II, 341f. Friedrich III, 2, 1182f.

³ Pomponio Leto, 314.

⁴ Quirinus, 805.

who had "weak faith"; every good Christian had always unreservedly believed the Pope, and hereafter it would depend upon the Pope alone what should be believed.¹ In opposition to the Gallicans, who wished to see inserted the words, "based upon the testimony of the Churches," Gasser proposed, on behalf of the majority, to remove all ambiguities by adding, in the fourth chapter in the definition of Infallibility, that the decisions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable "in themselves, and not by the consent of the Church" (*ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ*). Thus, as Mgr. Pie says,² it would be evident that all ecclesiastical sovereignty is united in the vicar of Jesus Christ, and that the infallibility of "the head of the episcopate" is independent of the adhesion of the Church. This amendment was not discussed at all; it only came forward at a time when the minority had left the Council, and when some of the members of that party were on the way home to their dioceses. But resistance was now useless, and the proposed amendment, together with another, meant to remove a doubtful patristic quotation, was carried without remonstrance.

The president then notified a protest from the presiding cardinals "in defence of the honour of the Council." The fathers put their heads together in their curiosity to learn what the protest was about. As soon as it was known that the five cardinals protested against the two French pamphlets, *Ce qui se passe au Concile* and *La dernière heure du Concile*, which were accused of containing "the most disgraceful lies,"³ Dupanloup rose in anger and left the *aula* "violet jusqu' aux yeux."⁴ Most people could not but agree with Pomponio Leto,⁵ when he remarked that a protest against lies in general, without giving further particulars, will, as a rule, be but waste of energy, and many accordingly remained sitting when adhesion to the protest was to be signified by rising. "A fanatical howl" then broke out, and certain zealous members of the majority hotly expressed their indignation because all did not stand up.⁶ Every member

¹ "Quid credendum sit, unice ab arbitrio Pontificis in posterum dependebit."

² Baunard II, 413f.

³ The protest in *Collectio Lacensis*, 760f., and in Friedberg, 621f.

⁴ Maynard, 277.

⁵ Pomponio Leto, 313.

⁶ Ollivier II, 341.

then received two copies of the protest. One was to be taken home for closer consideration, the other was to be signed on the spot, and to be kept amongst the documents of the Council as a testimony that the signer approved of the protest against the complaints which had been made about the want of liberty at the Council. According to Hefele's account, written some weeks afterwards to Döllinger, many of the minority were taken by surprise. "It really required a good deal of strength," writes the Bishop of Rottenburg, "to defend oneself against the importunate, and to remain seated without signing."¹ But several held their position bravely. Haynald declared that he could not join in any protest until the books in question were translated into Latin; and Schwarzenberg at once blamed the president for "this unworthy scene."

After this very painful episode, a papal ordinance was announced, giving those bishops, who wished for reasons of health and occupation to go home, permission to do so. But they were to be back on St Martin's Day (11th November); for it was not the Pope's intention to dissolve or adjourn the Council; but exceptions from the general rule might be made.² The secretary read, in accordance with this communication, the names of a number of bishops and apostolic vicars, living far away, who, for urgent reasons, begged leave to go home without being obliged to return. The permission was granted, and the general Congregation ended with the announcement that two days later a public and solemn session would be held, in which the final vote on the dogma of Infallibility would take place.³

On the next day (17th July) Dupanloup made a last desperate attempt to hinder the proclamation of the dogma in dispute. He sent a letter to Pius IX., in which he suggested that in the solemn session the successor of St Peter, as soon as the dogma had been adopted by voting, should declare that out of prudence and apostolic moderation he would postpone the confirmation of it to a more favourable time, when men's minds had again calmed down.⁴ This,

¹ The letter of 10th August, 1870. Friedberg III, 2, 1188.

² *Collectio Lacensis*, 761f.

³ *Ibid.*, 480.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 992f. Cp. Baunard II, 415.

which the Bishop of Orléans thought "so simple a method," Pius IX., of course, neither would nor could use, and he got seriously angry with his importunate counsellor. "What does he want now?" he exclaimed in annoyance when he received Dupanloup's letter; and as soon as he had read it, he exclaimed: "He thinks that I am a child!" and to two bishops who entered just then he said angrily: "This Bishop of Orléans is mad! He wants me to stop the mouth of the Holy Ghost and of the Council—I, the Pope, who am merely the mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost! The Bishop of Orléans is mad; he is mad!"¹

But before the sun set he received other warnings against the step he was about to take. In the morning the opposition had held a meeting, at which Haynald, supported by Hefe, Ginouilhac of Grenoble, and others,² proposed that the minority should be present at the public session, vote *Non placet*, and "to the demand for submission return a negative answer."³ But most members of the opposition were unwilling to go so far. Cardinal Mathieu, Strossmayer, and Dupanloup, out of reverence for the Pope, shrank back from this logical consequence of previous action, and a few expressed their fears of violence on the part of the majority, if the minority were to attend and vote *Non placet*. There were in all but twenty who had the courage or the will to carry resistance to the new dogma to the utmost. They agreed, therefore, to prepare a joint letter (*scriptura*) to Pius IX.,⁴ in which the signatories stated that, "out of filial love and reverence," they could not bring themselves to vote *Non placet* at the public meeting, but that they would stay away from it, and return home to the flocks which so urgently needed their pastors. Only fifty-six—amongst them Schwarzenberg, Mathieu, Simor, Darboy, Ginouilhac, Haynald, Scherr, Kenrick, Strossmayer, Maret, Foulon, Dupanloup, Hefe, and Krentz—signed this document, in which the Pope was reminded that eighty-eight fathers, "compelled by their conscience, and from love of the Church of Christ," had voted *Non placet* at the general

¹ Maynard, 279, after Bishop Pie's account.

² Darboy was absent on account of indisposition. *Manning* II, 447.

³ Friedrich III, 2, 1193. Cp. Maynard, 277, and Ollivier II, 342f.

⁴ *Collectio Lacensis*, 994f.

congregation on 13th July; that sixty-two had then voted *Placet juxta modum*; and that seventy had stayed away without voting. Since 13th July nothing had happened which could cause the signatories to alter their vote; on the contrary, important events had happened which compelled them to abide by it. From the signatures, those of Melchers of Cologne, Ketteler, and Rauscher were missing. The first announced, in a letter of 17th July,¹ to the president of the Council, that it was impossible for him with a good conscience to vote *Placet* at the public meeting, and in order to reach home before war between France and Prussia prevented his return, he meant to leave Rome before the final vote; but he promised to submit to the decisions of the Council and the Pope. Ketteler sent Pius IX. a similar letter, which ended with the declaration that he would submit himself entirely to the definitions of the Council, just as if he had been present and voted *Placet*.² Rauscher considered also that by voting *Non placet* at the general congregation he had done all he could to bring about that solution of the question which he himself desired; by voting *Non placet* at the public session he would not be able to prevent the adoption of the dogma. "I was convinced," wrote the Cardinal of Vienna six months afterwards, "that I did my duty to the Church by my remonstrance; but in the decision I recognised the hand of Divine Providence, and its ways are full of wisdom and grace, even if human reason cannot discern it." He had said the same to the Pope when he took leave of him, and he had also given the promise that he would submit to the decision when made, and adore the ways of the Divine Providence. His biographer, one of the learned sons of St Benedict, goes into raptures over "the royal soul" of the Cardinal, who fell at the feet of the Pope and said: "I sacrifice my will, my Isaac!"³

This sacrifice of the will was scarcely easier for the members of the opposition than the *sacrificio dell' intelletto*, which Jesuitism had originally demanded. On the afternoon of Sunday, 17th July, Odo Russell was at the railway station at Rome in order to see who were leaving, and he at once informed Manning

¹ *Collectio Lacensis*, 993.

² *Ibid.*, 994.

³ Wolfsgruber, 439.

that twenty bishops had left the city; he had spoken to Melchers, Ketteler, Haynald, and Dupanloup.¹ The two last left in the same compartment. Their state of mind was one of depression. The two prelates huddled themselves up, each in his corner; and at dawn of day, whilst Dupanloup, according to his custom, was reading his breviary, the Archbishop of Colocza suddenly cried to him: "Monseigneur, we have made a great mistake!"—by not remaining and voting *Non placet*.²

But the "great mistake" was irreparable. Whilst the two bishops sat silent and depressed in the railway train, the new dogma was proclaimed.

The public meeting on 18th July was, according to the testimony of all, characterised by "a majestic and earnest solemnity," which made a great impression upon those who were present.³ It was not only the thundercloud that passed over Rome during the meeting, discharging vivid flashes of lightning and violent peals of thunder, which attuned men's minds to earnestness. Both the moral and the material atmosphere were, as Manning says, charged with electricity.⁴ Only a small portion of the episcopate took part in the last vote. Germany and Austria-Hungary were very thinly represented; the episcopate of France, England, Ireland, and the United States was divided, and even amongst the bishops of Northern Italy the opposition had adherents. There was also division in the narrowest circle of the Vatican itself. Hohenlohe, Mérode, and Passavalli, who preached the opening sermon, had not been able to reconcile themselves to the conduct of the Council, or to the results of its work. Not even all the Orientals could be compelled by the Propaganda to appear in the *aula* on 18th July. There were then about 917 dioceses in the whole of Roman Catholic Christendom, but only 535 bishops were present at the decisive moment. These did not in fact represent half of the Roman Catholic Church. Two

¹ Purcell II, 447.

² Thus Lagrange III, 161. Maynard (p. 282) has another explanation of the "mistake"; according to him Haynald repented that he had gone too far in his opposition!

³ See, for example, Pitra's letter in Cabrol: *Histoire du Cardinal Pitra*, 286.

⁴ Purcell II, 451.

hundred and thirty-four actual bishops were absent, and the Italian bishops, the cardinals, the officials of the Church, and the apostolic vicars made up about four-fifths of the majority.¹

The public session was opened as usual with a Mass, with the placing of the Holy Scriptures on the altar in the middle of the Council, and with the *Veni Creator Spiritus*.² When the hymn had been sung, the secretary of the Council delivered to Pius IX. the text of the new dogmatic constitution *Pastor Æternus*. The Pope gave the document to Bishop Valenciani of Fabriano and Matelica, who then mounted the ambo and read the whole constitution, consisting of four chapters. As soon as the reading was ended, Valenciani addressed the following question to the assembled fathers: "Reverend fathers, do you assent (*placentne*) to the decrees and canons which are contained in this constitution?" He then descended from the ambo, and the voting began by roll-call. During the roll-call the storm broke out with violence—to the joy of the ultramontane members, who in the thunder of heaven saw a divine confirmation of the condemnation of Gallicanism and Liberal Catholicism. The Pope was to them a new Moses, who amidst thunder and lightning announced the will of God.³

Five hundred and thirty-three of those present voted *Placet*, and only two, the Bishops Riccio of Cajazzo in Naples, and Fitzgerald of Littlerock in the United States, said *Non placet*. The "scrutator" who collected the votes was so accustomed to everybody saying *Placet*, that he repeated *Placet* also on behalf of the Bishop of Cajazzo, but Riccio with a stentorian voice shouted out his *Non placet* over the assembly. Evil tongues asserted, however, that this brand new bishop had only said *Non placet* in order to give a proof of the freedom of the Council, which Jesuitism might afterwards make use of.⁴ Bishop Fitzgerald is said to have originally intended not to take part in the voting, but when it was pointed out to him that all the bishops present were to vote, he also said *Non placet*. Mgr. Pie claims, however, to know that one of the two bishops who voted *Non Placet* submitted himself

¹ Friedrich III, 2, 120.

² *Collectio Lacensis*, 481f.

³ Ollivier II, 348f. Baunard II, 414.

⁴ Pomponio Leto, 316f. [Riccio had already held his see for ten years.]

to the Pope on the evening of the same day, and confessed his faith in the decisions of the Council, and that the other did so the next morning.¹ The advocates of Infallibility had the satisfaction of hearing Landriot of Reims saying *Placet*, and even Cardinal Guidi got the difficult word past his lips. But Hohenlohe and De Mérode had stayed at home.²

After the voting was over, Pius IX. rose to give the decisions of the Council the confirmation of his apostolic authority.³ And then he delivered a speech, in which he expressed his hope that those who had voted against the constitution would come to a better understanding. With an allusion to 1 Kings xix. 2, he said that the opponents of the dogma had pronounced their judgment in a "storm," but they were to know that the Lord was not in the storm. A few years before (1867?), he said, they had judged otherwise, but then they had judged "in the soft, gentle wind (Vulg., *sibilus auræ tenuis*)."

The interest in the important vote at Rome was not great. Some houses from early morning, as was customary, were decorated with carpets hung out, but in the evening only the public buildings, the religious houses, and a very few private ones were illuminated.⁴ Only the diplomatic representatives of Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Monaco, and a few South American States showed themselves in the hall; the great powers were conspicuous by their absence. But the large space was filled with monks and nuns. The monks clapped their hands and shouted *Bravo* at the Pope's words; the nuns were touched and sighed: *Papa mio!* A poetical priest, after the meeting, gave vent to his ultramontane feelings in a poem which ran thus:—

"Parla, o gran Pio!
Ciò che suona il tuo labbro
Non è voce mortal,
È voce di Dio!"

¹ Baunard II, 414.

² About De Mérode's submission also Mgr. Pie has a story to tell, in Baunard, *loc. cit.*

³ His words were: "Decreta et canones, qui in Constitutione modo lecta continentur, placuerunt patribus omnibus duobus exceptis. Nosque, sacro approbante Concilio, illa et illos, ut lecta sunt, definimus et apostolica auctoritate confirmamus." *Collectio Lacensis*, 487f.

⁴ Pomponio Leto, 316. Friedrich III, 2, 1200.

By the proclamation of Infallibility the ultramontane party in the Roman Church had for the present reached its aim. But the Council had not fulfilled all the wishes of Ultramontanism. Several groups of the fathers of the Council had hoped to have the bodily ascension of Mary dogmatically defined, as her immaculate conception had been defined long before.¹ A hundred and eight fathers had asked to have the *conceptio immaculata* admitted into the *Ave Maria*, so that it might for the future run in this form: *Sancta Maria, Virgo immaculata, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus*.² Others had been zealous to procure for Joseph, the foster father of our Lord, "due honour" in the liturgy;³ others again wished to see St Francis of Sales elevated to a *doctor ecclesiæ*.⁴

But all these unfulfilled wishes were nothing as compared with the result achieved by the constitution *Pastor Æternus*.⁵ Chapter III. of this constitution runs thus: "If anyone asserts that the Roman Pontiff holds merely an office of supervision and administration, and does not possess full and supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in those matters which concern the discipline and direction of the Church dispersed throughout the world; or that he has only the principal part (*potiores partes*) but not the entire plenitude of supreme power; or that this his power is not an ordinary and immediate power (*non esse ordinariam et immediatam*) both over the churches each and all, and over each and all of the pastors and of the faithful, let him be accursed!"⁶ In the fourth chapter it is represented as a dogma revealed by God (*divinitus revelatum dogma*) "that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when, in the exercise of his office as the pastor and teacher of all Christians, he defines by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority the doctrine concerning faith and morals to be held by the universal Church, is, by the Divine assistance promised to him in the person of St Peter, possessed of that infallibility

¹ *Postulata* about it in *Collectio Lacensis*, 868f.

² *Ibid.*, 873.

³ *Collectio Lacensis*, 895f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 897f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 485.

⁶ The particular portion of canon law that is now taught in the Vatican seminary shows better than anything else the importance of this for the Roman system as the conclusion of a long evolution. See H. M. Pezzani: *Codex S. Cath. Rom. Ecclesiæ* I, 53f. (Rome 1893).

wherewith the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine concerning faith and morals; and that for this cause such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not because of the consent of the Church. And if any (which God forbid) should presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema."¹

If any single man were able to ascribe to himself the honour of this victory, it would be the Archbishop of Westminster, *il diavolo del Concilio*. When he came home from St Peter's at one o'clock on 18th July, he found on his table a picture of the Jesuit dogmatic theologian, Bellarmine. It was a present from the Jesuits of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, and an inscription on the picture announced that it was intended to be a memorial of the fourth session of the Vatican Council.² The gift and the givers reveal who it was that gained the victory at the Vatican Council. Undoubtedly it was a pleasure to Manning to possess this testimony of the gratitude of the Jesuits. But his opinion of them changed greatly before he died. Scarcely twenty years after that July day, in a document intended to set forth the hindrances which stood in the way of the spread of the Roman Church in England, he mentions as the ninth and last, the Society of Jesus.³ Unfortunately his biographer has not dared to publish this section of the Cardinal's religious and political testament.

¹ "Romanum pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque ejus modi Romani pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse. Si quis autem huic Nostrae definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, præsumpserit; anathema sit." *Collectio Lacensis*, 487.

² Pomponio Leto, 330.

³ Purcell II, 774.

CHAPTER XXI

THE FALL OF ROME

THE Italian government had followed the deliberations of the Council with the greatest attention. Giovanni Lanza, who was at that time Prime Minister, had at Rome, in his friend Berti, a trusted agent, who was in communication with the most conciliatory Italian prelates, and what Berti heard through them of the proceedings of the Council, and of the transactions which took place behind the scenes, was immediately passed on to Florence.¹

But the Italian statesmen were, like all European diplomats, occupied by other and greater things than the Council. The year 1870 was to others besides Count von Beust, *ein Jahr unablässiger Aufregung*.² Rouher's *Jamais l'Italie n'ira à Rome*³ had for a time caused a break in the good relations between Italy and France; but as early as 1868 negotiations had been opened between the governments of those two countries and Austria, on the initiative of the Emperor Napoleon III.,⁴ for the formation of a triple alliance. For the moment, however, only personal letters were exchanged between the three sovereigns; and the negotiations seemed hopeless. It was well known both at Florence and Vienna that Napoleon III. had for a long time perceived clearly that the part of the Papacy as a temporal power was played out. But out of regard to the clerical party, who had champions amongst those nearest

¹ E. Tavallini: *La vita e i tempi di G. Lanza* (Torino 1887) II, 27.

² Graf von Beust: *Aus drei Viertel-Jahrhunderte* II, 401.

³ See p. 285.

⁴ See Nigra's *Ricordi diplomatici*, in the *Nuova Antologia*, IXth. series, vol. LVI., (Rome 1895) 6, in opposition to Prince Napoleon in the *Revue des deux mondes* IIIrd. Période, 26th part (Paris 1878), 492.

to him, he would not hear of the incorporation of the city of Rome into the kingdom of Italy. The Cavaliere Nigra, on the other hand, on behalf of the Italian government, had declared that there was no possibility of an alliance between France and Italy if the Emperor would not give way respecting Rome. And as to this point Beust supported and encouraged the Cabinet of Florence. From Vienna Metternich, who was then the Austrian ambassador at Paris, received a despatch to the effect that Austria would not be able to induce Italy to join with her until "the Roman thorn" had been extracted.¹ Beust, who had to face a Liberal and anticlerical majority, dared not oppose the wish of Italy to occupy Rome, and Metternich, therefore, much against his will,² had to negotiate with Napoleon on this basis.

If Prince Napoleon understood his Imperial cousin aright, Napoleon III., with regard to the projected triple alliance, as well as with regard to much besides, entirely failed to appreciate the real facts of the case. The French Emperor seems to have imagined that the quite private letters, which he had exchanged with Victor Emmanuel and Francis Joseph, formed such a sure foundation for a treaty of alliance, that only a few days were needed to bring an alliance about. Nigra, however, maintains that this was a complete misunderstanding, and there can be no doubt that he is right.

On 12th July Nigra was invited to St Cloud. The Emperor himself then believed that peace would be preserved, and Nigra, on behalf of his government, could only say that Italy much wished to see it maintained.³ Even after the hostile meeting at Ems, Nigra next day advised the Duke of Gramont to be conciliatory; but Visconti-Venosta at the same time gave the assurance that France had no need to fear that Italy would be on the side of the enemy.⁴ After the scheme for a triple alliance had failed and France on 19th July had declared war on Prussia, Beust contemplated making a treaty with Italy alone for an armed neutrality and concerted diplomatic action. The two states would thus find time to complete their armaments, and they might perhaps at an opportune

¹ Prince Napoleon, *loc. cit.*, 497.

² Madame Rattazzi: *Rattazzi et son temps* (Paris 1887) II, 336.

³ Nigra, *loc. cit.*, 9.

⁴ Nigra, 14.

moment exercise diplomatic or military pressure in favour of France.

Count Vitzthum on 1st August brought the draft of such a treaty to Florence, and on the following day the draft was communicated by Count Vimercati to the Emperor Napoleon, who was then staying at Metz. But the alliance in the meantime was to remain a secret from the rest of Europe. One of the articles in the draft was to the effect that Austria-Hungary should request France to recall her troops as speedily as possible from the papal territory; and the evacuation was to take place on conditions "that were in accordance with the wishes and interests of Italy, and which might secure internal peace in that kingdom." Napoleon appreciated the good offices of the two powers, but he could not at all approve of the article about the Roman question. On 26th July the Duke of Gramont had informed Nigra that France would under no circumstances go beyond maintaining the September Convention,¹ and on the following day he had charged the French ambassador at Vienna to tell Count von Beust that the Tuileries would not suffer any interference in the Roman question on the part of Austria-Hungary. The Emperor repeated the same thing on 3rd August, after reading the Austrian proposal, in a despatch from Metz to the Duke of Gramont. The despatch said categorically: "In spite of X.'s [*i.e.* Vimercati's] proposal, and in spite of [Prince] Napoleon's efforts, I do not consent as regards Rome."² And it was related in Italy that the Empress Eugénie had said: "Rather the Prussians in Paris than the Italians in Rome."³ The Italian government, however, was not itself satisfied with the Austrian proposal. At Florence they wished the article in question to promise non-intervention on the part of Austria-Hungary, and an arrangement of the affairs of the Roman territory in accordance with the wishes and interests of the Romans and Italians.⁴

These negotiations for an alliance had not remained entirely hidden from the rest of the world. The Vatican believed the rumours about the triple alliance, and was deeply moved at such a contingency. On 25th July the Austrian Minister of

¹ See p. 251.

² Prince Napoleon, 498.

³ Lanza's speech at Cadorna: *La liberazione di Roma* (Torino 1889), 51.

⁴ Nigra, 16.

Public Worship, Von Stremayr, had proposed to the Emperor Francis Joseph to repeal the imperial patent of 5th November 1855, giving legal force to the Concordat of 18th August of that year.¹ Stremayr argued that the party with whom Austria had concluded that Concordat in 1855, had, after the proclamation of the Infallibility, changed its identity by that proceeding. There was, therefore, a *causa gravis, justa, et rationabilis*, which, according to the views of the canon lawyers and the scholastic divines, would give the other party a right to retire from the Concordat. No doubt the papal Infallibility was, according to the definition, only to concern matters of faith and morals; but it was first of all the infallible Pope who was himself to decide what fell under the head of "faith and morals," and so was covered by his infallibility; and next it was matter of common knowledge that the popes from ancient times had included practically all relations between man and man in the description of "faith and morals." In order to meet the dangers which now threatened, since the proclamation of the new dogma, the minister proposed to repeal the imperial patent of 5th November 1855. Two days later Stremayr asked Count von Beust to give his attention to the proposal of the Ministry of Public Worship, and without delay, on 30th July, the Chancellor sent to the Austrian ambassador at Rome, the Ritter von Palomba, a despatch containing the statement that the imperial government considered the Concordat of 1855 as abrogated.²

At the same time the Vatican received news from Paris that boded misfortune. On 30th July the Duke of Gramont telegraphed to the Marquis de Banneville, the French ambassador at Rome, that he was to prepare the Pope for the speedy recall of the French garrison. The next morning De Banneville carried the disagreeable tidings to Antonelli, and the Cardinal immediately went to the Pope to prepare him for what was coming. Pius IX. received the announcement with great calmness. He looked up to heaven and said: "Now it is time for prayer! But everything will end well."³ The next day the Duke of Gramont explained in a long

¹ See above, p. 198.

² Beust, 406. Wolfgruber: *Cardinal Rauscher*, 207f.

³ II. d'Ideville: *Les Piémontais à Rome* (Paris 1874), 151.

despatch to the Marquis of Banneville, that it was not strategic reasons which made the French government recall its few regiments from Cività Vecchia, but only the wish to carrying out the September Convention loyally. "If we go to war," wrote the French Foreign Minister, "without having Italy as our ally, or without at least being sure of its neutrality, we must have not 5,000 but 100,000 men at Rome; for sound sense would compel us to be prepared for a conflict with the Italian government, to which we should have afforded a pretext for considering itself free from the convention, and for reserving to itself full freedom of action."¹ Antonelli fully understood the views of the Duke of Gramont, and he did not conceal the fact that the Vatican had only France to rely upon, and that it was convinced that the defeat of France would be the beginning of an European deluge, in which the see of St Peter would undoubtedly lose everything.²

The sudden zeal of France for the September Convention was, in the view of Italian politicians, somewhat uncalled for. For Napoleon III. had in reality violated the convention himself, when, in 1867, to stop Garibaldi, he sent General Failly with 2,000 men to Cività Vecchia, and from thence to Rome and Mentana.³ There was, however, an unexpressed understanding, which La Marmora had hinted at in 1864, that the two powers who had made the convention were in "extraordinary cases" to enjoy freedom of action. Italy had therefore, in 1867, acquiesced in the French breach of the convention, but Napoleon III. did not seem to the Italians to be especially entitled to stickle for the letter of the convention.⁴

And, just at that moment, the French government was obliged to sue for the friendship of Italy at all hazards. On 7th August the Duke of Gramont informed the Cavaliere Nigra that the French ambassador at Florence had been ordered to feel his way with Victor Emmanuel, and to find

¹ The despatch of the Duke of Gramont of 31st July 1870 in J. Favre: *Rome et la République française* (Paris 1871), 32f.

² The despatch from the Marquis de Banneville of 15th August containing the gist of the conversation with Antonelli; Favre, 36f.

³ See above, p. 284f. Cp. Stefano Castagnola: *Come il Gabinetto Lanza ci condusse a Roma*, in the *Rivista storica del risorgimento Italiano* I, 1 (Torino 1895), 25. Castagnola was Minister of Commerce and Agriculture in the Lanza ministry.

⁴ Tavallini II, 27.

out whether Italy would be willing to send 60,000 men over the Mont Cenis.¹ Victor Emmanuel himself was much bent upon coming to the help of France; he always felt a debt of gratitude to Napoleon III., and he thought with anxiety of what might befall his daughter, the consort of Prince Napoleon. But the popular feeling in Italy was against the French, and became more so day by day. The Italians did not feel inclined to take part in a war of adventure, and they had a secret mistrust of the efficiency of the French army. General Cialdini was the only general who was on the King's side, and the council of war, which Victor Emmanuel summoned, declared plainly that it was impossible to gratify the wish of France. If Italy joined in and sent 60,000 men over the Mont Cenis, it would also have to guard the northern frontier against Bavaria, double the troops on the papal border, and be prepared for internal disturbances. In reality, a much greater force would need to be mobilised than the 60,000 men desired by France. Mazzini was already at work reopening his "republican apostolate," and there was no reason to expect that Garibaldi would remain quiet in Caprera, when a great part of Europe was in flames. Lanza, therefore, for safety's sake, had Mazzini arrested at Palermo, and took him to Gaëta; and the fleet kept watch off Caprera.²

But the French would not abandon the hope of help from Italy. On 19th August Ollivier informed Ricasoli that he had come secretly to Italy to stir up the zeal of his friends for his noble country,³ and on 20th August Prince Napoleon arrived at Florence with a personal instruction from the Emperor, and a military order from MacMahon.⁴ Victor Emmanuel, in spite of the resistance of the generals, was still inclined to send the desired help, but the Cabinet and the Chamber of Deputies were decidedly against the adventurous policy which the King advocated. Feeling became still cooler towards France when Visconti-Venosta declared in the Chamber that Prussia would not oppose an Italian march to Rome.⁵ Rattazzi assured Prince

¹ Nigra, 19.

² Tavallini II, 5. Castagnola, 22f.

³ His letter in *Lettere e documenti del barone Bettino Ricasoli* per cura di M. Tabarrini e A. Gotti (Firenze 1895) X, 112.

⁴ Prince Napoleon, p. 499.

⁵ Castagnola, 19.

Napoleon, who had sent for him, that Victor Emmanuel would be signing his own abdication, if he induced the Cabinet to arm, were it only four men and a corporal, for the help of Napoleon III.,¹ and the Minister of Finance, Sella, affirmed that the Italian Chamber of Deputies would not vote a centesimo to soldiers who were to cross the Mont Cenis. A great meeting of protest was held at Leghorn, which declared: "Napoleon gave us Mentana; for twenty years he has kept us back from our capital; he has tried his chassepot guns upon our brothers; he does not deserve the help of the Italians." Outside the Foreign Office at Florence great crowds assembled, shouting: "Long live Prussia! Long live Rome! Down with Napoleon!"² But Prince Napoleon would not give up hope. He remained at Florence until the catastrophe at Sedan had destroyed the last chance, and he did not even then depart, until Lanza politely gave him a passport for the journey.³

On the same day that Prince Napoleon arrived in Florence, the Chamber of Deputies held a stormy sitting. The government had asked for 40,000,000 *lire* for military preparations. Many thought that this money was to be used for the benefit of France; accordingly, all the ill-feeling against Napoleon and the September Convention found expression during the debate.⁴ Mancini blamed the ministry for having consented to fulfil that convention which was so fatal to the hopes of the nation. France, Mancini said, by occupying Rome afresh in 1867, tore the convention to pieces herself, and cannot bring it to life again; Rouher by his *jamais* has clearly shown that it means the giving up of Rome; and, in spite of that, the ministry persists in feeling itself bound by it! Nicotera shouted to the ministers: "If you will not yourselves go to Rome, then at least go your way and let us get there." Visconti-Venosta answered these angry utterances with great self-control, and comforted the opposition by pointing out that treaties under altered circumstances might lose their significance. He also declared that the government would never abandon the national policy, the aim of which was the completion of the unity of

¹ *Rattazzi et son temps* II, 340.

² *Rattazzi, loc. cit.*

³ Castagnola, 32. Cp. Tavallini II, 32f.

⁴ Castagnola, 20.

Italy. The stormy meeting ended with an order of the day, expressing the conviction of the Chamber that the ministry would secure a solution of the Roman question in accordance with the *aspirazioni nazionali*. Two hundred and fourteen members voted for the order of the day; 152 against it; 12 did not vote.

On the previous day the last French troops had left Civit  Vecchia. The report of this fact increased the impatience of the Italians. It was now more loudly demanded from all sides that Rome should be occupied, and the ministers had great difficulty in appeasing the popular feeling. For the moment the government was content with mustering 30,000 soldiers on the papal frontier, in order to prevent a revolution from forcing its way in from without, and on all sides was heard the cry, *Roma in mano dei Romani!* Many expected that the papal rule would collapse when it was no longer supported by French bayonets. But this expectation was not fulfilled. Most of the inhabitants of Rome had an old-standing affection for the Pope; some were indifferent to all politics, and the papal police kept a watchful eye on all disturbers of the peace; some remained quiet, because they were convinced that the Italians would immediately march in.¹

But the tranquillity in Rome was anything but acceptable to the ministry, who would have been glad that others should give them a hint when it was time to step in. It was supposed that Lanza and Visconti-Venosta would rather risk a civil war than violate the September Convention;² but it was known that Sella would no more ask for money from the Chamber for the maintenance of the papal power at Rome, than for the protection of Napoleon's throne. At the suggestion of Victor Emmanuel, Sella attended a meeting which the leaders of the opposition were holding. They told him plainly at that meeting: "The choice must now be made! Either the ministry must order the Italian army to occupy Rome, even if it should encounter a French army, or should enter over the dead bodies of the papal mercenaries, or else we leave Florence and go to Naples and Milan and proclaim the deposition of the Savoy dynasty, and the Italian Republic." Sella asked Rattazzi and Mancini to accompany him to the Pitti Palace, and to carry

¹ Tavallini II, 28. Castagnola, 21.

² Rattazzi, 348f.

to the King the ultimatum of the Left; but the meeting thought it best that Sella alone should carry this message to the King.¹

The impatience of the opposition made the situation of the Lanza ministry still more difficult. Amongst the Italian Right there were many who, like Ricasoli, had grave scruples about occupying Rome without the permission of the Pope.² Ricasoli thought that in any case there ought only to be a provisional occupation, until some other settlement were made by a congress of the Roman Catholic powers. And if Rome were occupied, the difficult problem would have to be faced, how to combine the Pope's right to full independence in spiritual matters, with the claim of Italy on Rome as part of the soil of Italy, or, in other words, how to establish the proper conditions for a sovereign pope without temporal power. On 28th August a ministerial council decided that the dogma of the Pope's Infallibility should not be allowed to be published in the kingdom of Italy, but orders were given not to visit the offence with punishment, except in cases where the publication of the dogma caused excitement and disturbance. The same ministerial council discussed the proposal of Cavour and Ricasoli, as to an arrangement of the future position of the Papacy, and also the important question already discussed at two former councils³—how far Rome was merely to be incorporated into Italy, or to be also the capital of the country. Several of the ministers, and many outside the ministry, felt inclined, even if Rome became the capital, to leave to the Pope the so-called "Leonine city" round the Vatican and the church of St Peter, in order to secure him an extra-territorial footing.⁴ It was to be assumed, as the condition of such an arrangement, that the Pope should be reconciled with Italy. In the opposite case, an ecclesiastical San Marino immediately beside the residence of the Italian king might create the most serious difficulties.⁵

Before these deliberations had led to a definite result, the

¹ Rattazzi, *loc. cit.*

² Ricasoli X, 108f. Letter of 2nd September 1870.

³ Castagnola, 27.

⁴ These proposals are printed amongst the *documenti* in F. Scaduto: *Guarentigie e relazioni tra stato e chiesa* (Torino 1884), 453f.

⁵ Ricasoli X, 126f.

news arrived of the capitulation at Sedan on 2nd September. The opposition at first thought of addressing an interpellation to Lanza, but Rattazzi thought it best first to discuss the question with Lanza, and on 3rd September he laid an address before the Prime Minister which he and Mancini had prepared.¹ It called upon the government to occupy Rome immediately, and concluded with a threat that in case the Italian flag did not begin to advance towards the Capitol, the people "would be prepared to safeguard its own salvation and honour." This threat, according to Rattazzi, made an impression upon Lanza, and Rattazzi further added that it was not inconceivable that the republic, which would undoubtedly succeed the empire in France, might find imitation elsewhere in Europe. Lanza asked for time to consider and opportunity for discussing with his colleagues, and he laid the matter before a cabinet council the same day. Only Sella and Castagnola were in favour of going forthwith to Rome,² and Lanza therefore answered Rattazzi the next day that the government would abide by its plain declarations to the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate; that it would take upon itself the responsibility for its acts, and be willing to render an account to Parliament if an interpellation were made to it.³

The discussion on the address from the opposition had evoked serious dissension in the ministry. Castagnola would have liked to resign, because the government seemed to him unable to solve a national question of such great dimensions.⁴ But Lanza induced him to remain by representing to him how indefensible it would be at such a moment to deliver over the government of the country to political adventurers.

It was not long, however, before Lanza had to fall in with the views of Sella and Castagnola. The Prussian bulletins of victory made King Victor Emmanuel uneasy, and in his anxiety he turned to the Liberal patrician, Count Gustavo Ponza di San Martino, the leader of the Permanente Club, which had in times past done so much for Italian unity.⁵ The Count of San

¹ Rattazzi, 369f.

² Castagnola, 33.

³ The answer in Rattazzi, 371.

⁴ Castagnola, 34.

⁵ The following is based upon information given in Rattazzi, 349f., according to "le récit confidentiel d'un des ministres présents au conseil à plusieurs personnes conues."

Martino endeavoured to show the King that Napoleon himself had broken the September Convention, and that there was nothing to be done but to occupy Rome; only thus could the agitation of the republican party be stopped, and the Pope saved; and only thus could the King keep his crown. Victor Emmanuel was much moved by the Count's way of putting the question, and asked him to attempt to convince the ministry that the time for action had come. The Count of San Martino promised to fulfil the King's wish if the King would write a note to Lanza stating that he was convinced that, as circumstances had developed, there was nothing to be done but to go to Rome. The Count would only use this intimation of the King's will in the last resort; but he could do nothing without having such a document in his pocket. Victor Emmanuel said that he would consider the matter more closely, and that he wished first to speak to Prince Napoleon, who was still living in the Pitti Palace, although, after the catastrophe at Sedan, the report had been spread abroad that he had left for London. Some hours later, the King again sent for the Count of San Martino, and gave him the note that he had spoken of.

The Count then went to Lanza, who called together the other ministers. Most of them, especially Visconti-Venosta, would not hear of the occupation of Rome, and some rather sharp words ensued between him and the Count of San Martino on the subject of true patriotism. As the conversation seemed likely to end in personalities, the Count gave Lanza the King's note. Sella then spoke and declared that he agreed with the King, and that he would send in his resignation if an army were not sent to Rome. Little by little, all the ministers submitted to the King's will. It was decided at a state council the same evening that both the papal territory and Rome were to be occupied. But the Count of San Martino was first to be sent to Pius IX. to inform him of what was going to happen, and to guarantee him perfect liberty to exercise his spiritual authority; Visconti-Venosta was at the same time to address a memorandum to Roman Catholic Europe, in order to reassure it.¹ On 6th September the organ of the government, *l'Opinione*, contained an announcement that the ministry, according to report, had decided to fulfil the wish of the nation and go to

¹ Castagnola, 34.

Rome. To this was added a hint of the mission of the Count of San Martino and of the contemplated memorandum. But instead of confirming the announcement in *l'Opinione*, the *Journal officiel* declared, to the general astonishment, that *tali notizie erano erronee*.¹ The ministry wished to be compelled to go to Rome, and it had its desire fulfilled. As soon as it was reported that the Republic had been proclaimed at Paris, the Roman republicans issued a manifesto which reminded people that the Roman *constituante* twenty-one years before had proclaimed a Roman republic, and counselled now the proclamation of a republic for the whole of Italy. It was necessary to interfere betimes with this republican agitation if Italy were not to be lost to the dynasty, and from all sides came entreaties to go to Rome. Petitions and deputations were sent to Florence from Viterbo, Frosinone, Velletri, Terracina, Fermo, and several other towns in the remnants of the Papal States, begging the ministry to put an end as quickly as possible to the anarchical disturbances in those parts; and from Lombardy, Romagna, and Venetia came addresses which showed that many of the citizens of Italy had nearly lost their patience.²

As the first step toward the occupation of Rome, therefore, Visconti-Venosta issued the contemplated circular on 7th September.³ He explained in it that the September Convention gave the Italian government a free hand in case affairs within the papal territories were such as to constitute a danger or a threat to the peace and security of Italy. This was now the case. The peace of Italy was endangered, because a theocratic government was kept up in an enclave within the peninsula, which was distinctly hostile to the kingdom, and which by its own confession could not exist without foreign aid. The Italian government must therefore reserve to itself the right of interfering as soon as there was danger of bloodshed in the papal territory, or if the security of the Pope were threatened. In such case, orders would be given to occupy those points which, for the sake of the public safety, must needs be occupied; but for the rest, the Italian government would let the population itself see to the direction of its affairs, and would do no more than safeguard the independence of the

¹ Rattazzi, 377.

² *Ibid.*, 378.

³ Printed in Favre, 368f.

Papacy, which must be a matter of concern to all states which had Roman Catholic subjects.

On 6th September, the day before this circular was issued, the Cavaliere Nigra had repaired to the new French Foreign Minister, Jules Favre,¹ to inform him that the Italian government could no longer abide by the *status quo* on the Roman question, but thought that for the sake of the peace of the peninsula it ought to occupy Rome, if, as there was reason to suppose, Count Ponza di San Martino's mission should fail. In the meantime it was hoped at Florence that the republican government in France would officially renounce the September Convention, which was practically a dead letter. Favre answered cautiously that the convention was certainly dead and ineffective, but that France, nevertheless, would not denounce it. If the country had been victorious and fortunate it might have been done; but since it was conquered, Favre, in spite of his personal antipathy to the convention, had not the courage to distress a venerable old man, or to cause pain to his Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. He was certainly convinced that Rome would be a prey to dangerous agitators if Italy did not occupy the town, and he would gladly see the Italians in Rome. But Italy must take such a step on its own responsibility. From the Italian envoys at Berne, Vienna, Munich, Karlsruhe, Madrid, and London came similar announcements, that Italy would be allowed full freedom of action with regard to Rome; but several governments found it necessary to add that they relied upon it that neither the Pope's personal security nor his spiritual authority would suffer.²

At this decisive moment there was a painful ministerial crisis at Florence. Victor Emmanuel could not forgive Lanza for being so resolutely opposed to the French desire for help; and, on the other hand, he was dissatisfied with Lanza's hesitation as to the occupation of Rome. Both privately and in the state council he vented his ill-humour against Lanza, so that the latter finally, on 7th September, thought it best to place his portfolio at the King's disposal. He wrote a letter in which, on account of the mistrust and ill-will the King always displayed towards him, he begged to be relieved of his

¹ Favre, 5f.

² Tavallini II, 37f. Favre, 37ff.

burdensome position.¹ This letter was the occasion of a verbal reconciliation, in which Victor Emmanuel declared that at the moment he neither could nor would do without Lanza; but, on the other hand, the Minister of War, General Govone, partly because of failing health, relinquished his place to General Ricotti, whom La Marmora had recommended to the King and Lanza.²

On 8th September the Count of San Martino left Florence to carry out the difficult task which the King and the ministry had entrusted to him. He brought a letter from Victor Emmanuel to Pius IX. On the evening of 9th September he was received by Cardinal Antonelli, and read him the instructions which Lanza had given him in a letter of 8th September.³ It contained the words: "We reserve then to ourselves the right to send our troops into the Roman territory, when circumstances, in our opinion, necessitate it (*quando le circostanze ci lo dimostrino necessario*), but we will allow the population to see to the administration of its own affairs. The King's government and his forces (*le sue forze*) will confine themselves exclusively to conservative action, and to the protection of the *diritti imprescrittibili* of the Romans, and of the interest which the whole Catholic world feels in the perfect independence of the Pope." The Count of San Martino was further to take pains to make the Pope understand the gravity of the situation with regard to the future of the Church and of the Papacy, and to tell him that the supreme head of the Catholic Church would find deep devotion on the part of the people of Italy, and be able on the banks of the Tiber to maintain an honourable position independent of any human power. The King hoped, therefore, that Pius IX. would not reject the hand stretched out to him in the name of religion and of Italy.

When the Count of San Martino had read these instructions to Antonelli, a conversation ensued, which lasted more than two hours.⁴ The Cardinal firmly maintained that the matter in question was nothing but an act of violence. The Holy

¹ Tavallini II, 41.

² Castagnola, 35.

³ Castagnola 38 and D'Ideville, 169f.

⁴ Cp. San Martino's report of 10th September in Tavallini II, 42f. and D'Ideville, 172.

See could not surrender any of its rights, and even the prospect of a revolution could not justify the action of Italy. On the following day at noon San Martino delivered to Pius IX. the letter from Victor Emmanuel, which, according to Castagnola,¹ proceeded from the pen of the Deputy Celestino Bianchi, one of Ricasoli's good friends, who for many years was editor of the Florentine journal, the *Nazione*. Victor Emmanuel addressed the Pope in this letter "with a son's devotion, the faith of a Catholic, a king's loyalty, and the sentiments of an Italian," and informed him that it was now necessary to occupy the papal territory for the sake of the Pope's security and the maintenance of order. The Count of San Martino was therefore charged to make arrangements with Pius IX. as to how this "precautionary measure," which was anything but a hostile act, might best be effected and the peace preserved.

The meeting between the Count and Pius IX. is said to have been stormy.² San Martino was a cold, proud, man, who entertained lofty ideas concerning his own dignity, and was convinced of the moral right of Italy to Rome. Pius IX. met him with the usual *Non possumus*, and said that it would have been better for Victor Emmanuel to have simply stated that he meant to enter the Pope's dominions than to have written such a letter as that which the Count brought. The audience lasted an hour, and it was afterwards said in Rome that Pius IX., when the Count was about to leave, called him back and said: "The idea then is, Signor Conte, that might comes before right." "No, most Holy Father," San Martino said; "might is not before right, but might acquires right." On his way out from the audience San Martino met Antonelli, who authorised him to telegraph to Florence that his mission had been unsuccessful, and that Pius IX. would neither part with his own soldiers nor open the gates of Rome to the Italian troops.³ "The Pope therefore wishes to fight; I hope he will be beaten," wrote the Count to Lanza. After the audience he received a letter for Victor Emmanuel, in which Pius IX. complained that the letter he had received was not worthy of a loving son, nor of a faithful Catholic, nor of a king either. He would not enter upon the details of the King's letter, but

¹ Castagnola, 39.

² Rattazzi, 356.

³ D'Ideville, 173.

only say that he blessed God, because He had allowed Victor Emmanuel to fill the closing years of his life with pain. For the rest, he would not admit the claims which Victor Emmanuel had made, neither could he approve of the principles expressed in the King's letter. He took his refuge in God, and would pray to him to grant the King the mercy of which he was in need.¹

The rumour of San Martino's unsuccessful mission spread like wildfire in Rome, and when Pius IX., some hours afterwards, drove to the Piazza di Termini to dedicate a new aqueduct, he was greeted with enthusiasm by the Romans, who had assembled in great numbers for the solemnity. After his return, he determined that a triduum should be celebrated in St Peter's to pray God to defend Rome, and keep the Italians away. Directly San Martino left Rome, General Cadorna was ordered to march across the papal frontier. On 11th September, the general issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of the papal territory, in which he assured them that the Italian army, "the symbol of the concord and unity of the nation," came to guard the safety of Italy and the liberty of the citizens, and that the independence of the Holy See would be more assured, when it was surrounded by free citizens than when it was supported by foreign troops.² Cadorna then passed the frontier, and the army advanced through Cività Castellana and Viterbo. The whole of Italy received the news of this step with the greatest joy.

While General Bixio went towards Cività Vecchia, Cadorna himself marched upon Rome. On 13th September, he received from Florence a telegraphic communication that the government wished the march to Rome to be hastened as much as possible.³ On the previous day it was decided at a ministerial council that General La Marmora should be the commandant of the city, and on the following days the ministers discussed the form of the plebiscite, which, after the occupation of Rome, was to be asked of all its inhabitants.⁴

On 16th September, Cività Vecchia opened its gates without

¹ Castagnola, 43.

² The proclamation in Cadorna: *La liberazione di Roma*, 128.

³ Cadorna, 137.

⁴ Castagnola, 44f.

bloodshed to General Bixio,¹ and by that time Cadorna was already close to Rome. On 13th September the French government had recalled the French soldiers who formed the Antibes legion,² chiefly in order that the Italians might not have to fight with men following the French tricolour.³ Two days after, Cadorna sent a flag of truce to General Kanzler, who commanded the papal troops, and asked of him, in the name of the King of Italy, permission to occupy Rome in order to maintain order. Kanzler answered that his Holiness wished Rome to be occupied by his own troops, and not by the troops of other sovereigns, and that the Pope would resist an Italian occupation with all the means at his disposal. After the fall of Cività Vecchia, Ricotti telegraphed to Cadorna that he ought to make another attempt to induce the papal government to give up the idea of resistance.⁴ Cadorna therefore sent General Carchidio to Kanzler with a letter, which announced that Cività Vecchia was in the hands of the royal troops, and proposed to the papal general that he should allow the Italian army to enter Rome without resistance. Kanzler answered that the surrender of Cività Vecchia could not alter the determination of his Holiness; he added with bitterness that it was strange to speak of humanity when such sacrilegious action was being taken as the Italians were now engaged in, and he begged Cadorna to consider the responsibility he took upon himself both towards God and towards history by proceeding further on the course of violence.

After the receipt of this answer, Cadorna ordered his troops to cross the Tiber, and he took up his headquarters early in the morning of 17th September in the Villa Spada, on the Via Salara. At noon Count Arnim came to Cadorna, to treat with him on the question whether it was possible to avoid bloodshed. He said that the military party had the upper hand in the Vatican, but he asked for twenty-four hours' armistice, that he might make another attempt to induce Pius IX. to surrender without fighting. Cadorna accepted the proposal, and the Count returned to Rome to

¹ The capitulation in Cadorna, 153f.

² See above, p. 275.

³ Castagnola, 50.

⁴ Cadorna, 158f.

put pressure upon Pius IX. and his warlike counsellors.¹ At the same time the ministry at Florence was discussing the attack on Rome. The Italian ambassador at Berlin had telegraphed to his government that the Roman troops meant to make an armed resistance, and also announced that the Pope would take flight on board an English ship.² Visconti-Venosta, who continued to have scruples as to the contemplated storming of Rome, then proposed, as a last chance of avoiding fighting, that Cadorna should promise to remain outside Rome, if Count Arnim could get Pius IX. to give orders that the foreign troops should leave Rome immediately, and without arms. But the other members of the ministry would not agree to the Foreign Minister's suggestion, and a message was telegraphed to Cadorna, that as all attempts at mediation had shown themselves to be useless, he should make himself master of Rome by force, but in such a manner that the Leonine city should not be occupied, and also that his action should be marked by the prudence and moderation which the political situation demanded.³

There was no disposition whatever in Vatican circles to lend an ear to Count Arnim. Those Romans who were attached to the Pope were filled with a deep scorn for "Count Bismarck's agent,"⁴ and Pius IX. had firmly resolved that resistance was to be offered, so that it might be evident to everybody what violent methods the Italian government had made use of. On 18th September Count Arnim informed Cadorna that his mission at the Vatican had been unsuccessful.⁵ Cadorna determined therefore to arrange everything for an attack on the following day, and this resolve was communicated to Pius IX. by a messenger under flag of truce.⁶ After receiving this notice the Pope wrote a letter to General Kanzler, in which he expressed his indignation that the troops of a Catholic king, without any reason whatever, should attack the capital of the Catholic world. But the defence against this attack was only to last sufficiently long to serve as a protest against the enemy's violence. As soon as a breach

¹ Cadorna, 171.

² Castagnola, 49.

³ The telegram in Castagnola, 50, and Cadorna, 186.

⁴ D'Ideville, 185f.

⁵ Cadorna, 175.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 180f.

had been made in the wall, negotiations were to be opened for the surrender of the city. The Pope concluded thus: "At a moment when the whole of Europe is weeping over the many sacrifices in a war between two mighty nations, it shall not be said that the vicar of Jesus Christ, however unjustly he be attacked, has given his consent to a great shedding of blood. Our cause is God's cause, and we put all our trust in Him."¹

Early on the morning of 20th September the Italian troops made ready for attack. At five o'clock the guns opened fire. Cadorna stood in the Belvedere of the Villa Albani to survey the battle, and General Kanzler took up a position in the Loggia at the Palazzo Rospigliosi, in order from thence to follow the Italians' attack.² He at once saw clearly that it was the part between the Porta Salara and the Porta Pia which was threatened. The attacks on the other points were evidently only intended to prevent the papal troops from massing at the Porta Pia.

Pius IX. had, some days previously, obtained from the foreign ambassadors a promise that they would hasten to the Vatican as soon as they heard the first gunshot. At half-past six o'clock, therefore, all the diplomatists met in the throne-room of the Vatican. At seven o'clock Pius IX. came out of his private apartments and entered his chapel to say Mass. While he was saying it the guns were heard thundering, and pieces of shells fell in the gardens of the Vatican. After Mass refreshments were handed round, whilst the aged Pope retired again to his rooms. He stood there and looked out of the windows with an expectant look, as if hoping that St Peter and St Paul would come to his rescue against the new Attila and his barbarian hordes. Some of his entourage counselled him to flee, and surrender the city of St Peter to the Piedmontese robbers. But Antonelli had taken care that he should be surrounded by trustworthy people, that is to say, by persons who would not advise anything but what the Secretary of State could approve of. The Duke Mario Massimo of Rignano was amongst these; and Pius IX. is

¹ The letter in D'Ideville, 190f.

² D'Ideville, 192f. The writer of the letter met the general on the Quirinal square and accompanied him to the Palazzo Rospigliosi.

reported to have said to him in this hour of anxiety, amid the thundering of guns: "You counsel me to flee; but I think that even if the Piedmontese at length take the temporal power from me, I shall not lose my sleep for that."¹ At nine o'clock he entered the throne-room and begged the diplomatists to communicate with the "Piedmontese" general, in order to procure as good terms as possible for their respective countrymen. "My poor Canadians," he said, "who will take care of them and protect them?" At ten o'clock Antonelli brought a despatch, in which General Kanzler announced that a breach had now been made in the walls by the Villa Bonaparte, on the left of the Porta Pia. Pius IX. then gave orders for the white flag to be hoisted, and said to the diplomatists: "Gentlemen! you are witnesses that I yield to the force of violence. Henceforth the Pope is King Victor Emmanuel's prisoner." He then took leave of the diplomatists, who hastened to General Kanzler, to be near him when he arranged the conditions for the capitulation of Rome with Cadorna, who had then taken up his headquarters in the Villa Albani (Torlonia).²

The chief of General Kanzler's staff had brought a letter to Cadorna, in which the General said that he had received orders to stop hostilities, in order to avoid further bloodshed.³ The negotiations for the capitulation began. Kanzler, probably as agreed upon with Antonelli, produced a draft, the first point of which was that the utmost respect should be paid to the Pope, the cardinals, and all clergymen, monks, and nuns. This point was easily agreed to, but a long discussion took place over various military details. Finally, a capitulation was agreed upon, the most important point of which was that the whole of Rome except the Leonine city (containing the Vatican and the Castle of S. Angelo) should be surrendered to the Italian army.⁴

After the capitulation the Italian soldiers entered Rome, followed by 3,000 or 4,000 *dimostranti*, i.e., returned political

¹ *Politica segreta Italiana*, 414.

² D'Ideville, 193f. Favre, 49. Cadorna, 199f.

³ Cadorna 211f. says the Italians had 45 dead, 132 wounded; the papal army 20 dead and 49 wounded. Cp., however, Vittorio Fiorini in the *Rivista storica del risorgimento Italiano* I, 185f.

⁴ Cadorna, 203f.

emigrants, and Radical Italians, who were to endeavour to stir up patriotic enthusiasm amongst the Romans. These *dimostranti*, who brought the news of the siege of Paris, went up to the Quirinal square, where a crowd of partisans, led by a certain Marquis del Gallo, received them with rejoicing. As soon as they perceived that they had nothing to fear from the papal soldiers, they pulled tricolour cockades and flags out of their pockets, and then they marched "in accordance with revolutionary tradition" to the Capitol.¹

On the following day the generals, with Cadorna at their head, made their entry into Rome, and at the same time the remnants of the papal army, which had bivouacked on the Piazza of St Peter, left Rome. As the last armed defenders of the Papacy marched through the Porta Cavalleggieri, Pius IX. appeared on the great steps of St Peter's, and blessed them.² After the papal troops were gone, tumults ensued in the Borgo, and a certain Tognetti, at the head of a small band, attempted to enter the Vatican. The papal gendarmes resisted, and a shot was fired. This made Antonelli anxious, and in his trouble he asked Arnim to request Cadorna to provide for the security of the people in the Leonine portion of the city. Arnim immediately went to Cadorna, who was holding a review of the troops out by the Porta San Pancrazio; but the General had scruples about acceding to the request to occupy the Leonine quarter also. It was the wish of the government that the Italian troops should keep away from that quarter, and there seemed to be no danger that the Pope would suffer personal injury, since he had the noble guard, the Swiss, and the gendarmes to defend him. Without a request in writing from the Pope, through Antonelli or Kanzler, Cadorna dared not, under any circumstances, allow his troops to cross the Ponte Sant' Angelo. But when Arnim shortly afterwards returned with a written petition to Cadorna to see that no disturbance took place outside the Vatican, the General immediately ordered two battalions to occupy the Piazza of St Peter and the streets leading to the Vatican. For safety's sake he telegraphed at the same time to Florence, and an answer arrived from thence to the effect that the

¹ D'Ideville, 197f.

² D'Ideville, 205. Favre, 51f.

government approved of what he had done. Two days afterwards Antonelli expressed the desire that the Italian troops should also occupy the Castle of Sant' Angelo. By this means the standard of Italy came to float there also, and thus the whole Leonine quarter, except the Vatican and St Peter's, had, in the course of a few days, passed into the hands of Italy.¹

The joy of the Romans was great, and congratulations from the whole of Italy poured in to Cadorna and the government at Florence. But dissatisfaction lurked in corners, and in many places in Rome bitter words were dropped concerning the Piedmontese army and Cadorna, who was accused of being an apostate priest and a former canon of the Cathedral of Milan.² Neither was the Cabinet easy until it heard what impression the bold occupation of Rome³ made upon the Catholic governments and peoples. There were Conservative Italians, like Ricasoli,⁴ who had many scruples; and the views of the foreign governments and peoples upon the occupation of Rome were not always identical. Crémieux, on behalf of the new French Republic, sent congratulations from Tours to the Italian troops;⁵ but faithful French Catholics were filled with grief and indignation. Count Beust could, of course, only approve of what had happened, but the Emperor Francis Joseph was not an indifferent spectator of the fall of Rome; and the Catholic societies sent protests to the Austro-Hungarian government, and petitions for intervention.⁶

The Prussian government had once for all made plain that no protest on its part was to be expected. Bismarck, who daily saw at close quarters the outbursts of the ill-will of the ultramontane French towards the Germans,⁷ treated the whole question with the greatest calmness—all the more so, because the *Kulturkampf* in Germany was beginning to come up. On 27th September, when the occupation of Rome and the future position of the Pope were being discussed in his circle, he said :

¹ Tavallini II, 52. Cadorna, 559f.

² Cadorna, 223.

³ "L'occupazione di Roma," says Tavallini II, 48, "era per l'Italia un atto di somma audacia."

⁴ Ricasoli X, 138.

⁵ The despatch in Cadorna, 372.

⁶ Cadorna, 367. Beust II, 412.

⁷ M. Busch: *Graf Bismarck und seine Leute während des Krieges mit Frankreich* (Leipzig 1878) I, 198.

"Yes, he must continue to be a sovereign; but the question is, how? One would be able to do more for him, if the Ultramontanes were not everywhere opposing us. I am accustomed to pay people back in their own coin." To these words he added some sarcasms about Count Arnim. "I should like to know," he said, "how our good Harry is getting on. Probably in one mood in the morning, in another in the evening, and the next morning again otherwise—just like his despatches."¹

During the days following the occupation of Rome, the rumours that the Pope intended to leave the city of St Peter gained more and more credence. It was no secret, that the General of the Jesuits was agitating to bring it about that Pius IX. should turn his back upon usurpation and revolution, in the assurance that European intervention would soon bring him home and give him back not Rome only, but also a good deal of the territories which "the Piedmontese robbers" had taken.² Antonelli continued to be a determined opponent of this project. He was so well acquainted with the feelings existing amongst European diplomatists that he knew that it might take a long time before Europe drew together and united in an armed intervention. But although he did not conceal his objections to a flight, people at Florence were afraid lest the views of the Jesuit General should prevail and Pius IX.'s departure should be accomplished in such a way that the whole of Catholic Europe would take up arms against Italy. In order to procure trustworthy information as to the amount of truth there was in the reports that Pius IX. meant to flee, the engineer, Diamilla Müller, was sent by the Italian government to Rome on 30th September. Müller was also to enquire through Pasquale Badia, a domestic prelate to the Pope, and through Don Mario Massimo, whether it was quite impossible to find a starting-point for a reconciliation with the Papacy.³ Müller telegraphed immediately to Florence, that at present there was no serious talk of the Pope leaving, but that people who knew, looked upon the idea of a reconciliation as impossible. In any case, it would not be advisable to take any steps in the

¹ Busch I, 205.

² Cappelletti III, 253.

³ *Politica segreta Italiana*, 418f.

matter before General La Marmora arrived at Rome. But, when he arrived on 12th October, it was at once evident that all attempts at reconciliation were futile; neither Pius IX. nor Antonelli would receive the chief Italian official in the papal city.¹

The ill-will of the Vatican was still further increased at the beginning of October by the popular vote on the incorporation of Rome in the Kingdom of Italy.

Long deliberations had taken place amongst the ministers regarding the form of the proposed plebiscite, but at length they had agreed upon the formula: "On the assurance that the Italian government will secure to the Pope the independence of his spiritual authority, we declare ourselves in favour of union with the Kingdom of Italy under the monarchical constitutional government of King Victor Emmanuel and his royal successors."² The conditional element in this formula, however, did not please the Romans; and two members of the Roman *Giunta* went to Florence to induce the government to provide another. The deputation succeeded in obtaining that the plebiscite should be worded as follows: "We wish for union with the Kingdom of Italy, under the government of King Victor Emmanuel and his successors." But in return the *Giunta* said in the proclamation which it addressed to the citizens of Rome: "Under the ægis of free institutions, we leave it to the Italian government to take such measures as will insure that the Pope's spiritual authority should remain independent." With regard to the voting in the Leonine city there were difficulties. Since the Italian government had officially declared, that the troops should be withdrawn from the *Città Leonina*, as soon as the Pope wished,³ it would have been most proper not to have allowed the inhabitants of this quarter to take part in the vote at all. Such was Cadorna's first thought; but this plan caused great indignation in the rest of Rome. The General, therefore, made a compromise. The urns in which the inhabitants of the *Città Leonina* might put their voting papers, were not placed in the Leonine city itself but in the adjoining *rione*.

From early morning on 2nd October a great part of Rome was dressed in festive trappings. The houses were decorated

¹ Cadorna, 271.

² *Ibid.*, 272.

³ *Ibid.*, 263.

with flags and carpets, and many of the inhabitants carried a *Si* on their hats, or the Italian tricolour in their buttonholes. But behind the enthusiasm on the surface, there was felt to be an under current of anxiety and annoyance at the destruction of the last remnants of the Pope's temporal power. At two o'clock the voting was ended, and the urns from the different quarters were then carried up to the Capitol, where the counting was to take place. Every time an urn came the crowd broke into joyful shouts, and the enthusiasm was particularly great when the urn marked *Città Leonina*, *Si* was brought. At half-past nine o'clock the result of the plebiscite was announced from the great steps of the Capitol. Forty thousand seven hundred and eighty-five Romans had voted Aye, 46 No. In the Leonine city 1,556 had voted Aye, and 1 No. In the city and province of Rome, in *Cività Vecchia*, Viterbo, Velletri and Frosinone, there were altogether 167,548 voters: 133,681 voted Aye, 1,507 No. Thus, even if we count all those who abstained from voting as Noes, there was a considerable majority for the union with Italy.

The plebiscite also revealed that the Roman aristocracy was divided, in spite of the fact that it was chiefly an *aristocrazia di sagrestia*. The Duke of Sermoneta led the Roman aristocrats who at once attached themselves to the new order of things, and he had a relatively large following.¹ The Dorias attached themselves so closely to Victor Emmanuel, that it was expected that Prince Doria Pamfili would become a minister of the royal house. Prince Colonna, it is true, kept personally aloof, and took his departure for Naples; but the Ultramontanes were annoyed because his sons "swore allegiance to the revolution." The papal party learnt also with anger that the Duke Cesarini and the Count of Santa-Fiora were already, as it was expressed, "advanced members of the sect." The same was the case with the Odescalchi, the Sciarra, and the Capranica. Don Baldassare Odescalchi offended the friends of the Papacy by walking down the Corso arm in arm with Radical politicians; it was sarcastically said, that he wished to be the Rochefort of Italy. And ladies like the Princess Pallavicini and her sister, the Duchess of Fiano, "undertook the political education of their husbands," to win them to the national cause.

¹ D'Ideville, 24of. Cp. *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 25th October 1870.

On 11th October a Roman deputation, headed by the Duke of Sermoneta, went to Florence solemnly to bring the plebiscite to Victor Emmanuel.¹ The King expressed to the deputation his delight at the unanimity of the plebiscite, and at the rejoicing with which it had been met throughout Italy. But he ended his speech with the following words intended to be heard in the Vatican: "As King and Catholic I adhere to my determination to secure the liberty of the Church and the independence of the sovereign Pontiff." A royal decree then gave the plebiscite legal authority, and promised to secure the position of the Pope by laws of guarantee.

But Pius IX. was not to be satisfied by Victor Emmanuel's words, and the prospect of laws of guarantee. On 20th October he issued the Bull, *Postquam Dei munere*,² suspending to a more opportune time the meeting of the Council, because "the sacrilegious invasion" did not leave it the requisite freedom, security, and peace. Two days later, Visconti-Venosta, in a circular to the ambassadors of Italy, issued an energetic protest against the idea that the Council would be wanting in freedom and security, because the Italians had occupied Rome. The Vatican took no notice of this assurance of the independence of the Holy See, and on 1st November, Pius IX. issued the encyclical, *Respicientes ea omnia*, which put the usurpers, their councillors and helpers, under the great ban of the Church. Victor Emmanuel, it is true, was not mentioned by name, but nobody could be in any doubt as to who was meant by the words, *eos omnes, qualibet dignitate, etiam specialissima mentione digna, fulgentes*.³ At the same time, Antonelli impressed upon the papal nuncios that they were to convince the Roman Catholic governments that the temporal power was an absolute necessity for the Pope if he was to be the governor of the Church in a responsible way.⁴

After the plebiscite the Jesuits continued with greater vehemence their agitation to get Pius IX. to leave Rome, and Antonelli thought it best in view of all contingencies to obtain through the French government the assurance of the Italian Cabinet that the Pope might, without hindrance,

¹ Cadorna 279.

² *Collectio Lacensis* VII, 497f.

³ Stepischnegg I, 408.

⁴ Cappelletti III, 262f.

leave Rome by land or by sea whenever he liked.¹ But the Italian government did all it could to prevent the Pope from leaving. A decree extended the inviolability of the Italian king to the Pope's person; another declared that the Italian press law was not to apply to the papal press; a third exempted all papal rescripts, bulls, and encyclicals from censorship, and allowed the successors of St Peter to post proclamations on the walls of the Vatican and on the doors of the three principal churches of Rome.²

These decrees could no more satisfy Pius IX. than previous efforts. He and his counsellors did not consider the papal sovereignty sufficiently secured by the fact that the Pope was exempted from being subject to the laws of Italy, and was as inviolable as the King. The papal sovereignty must contain something positive, and the Pope must be in possession of such material means that he should not be reduced to living by the bounty of the Italian king. Many great and small offences put the patience of the Vatican to severe tests. The Italians had at first intended to build a new palace in Rome for Victor Emmanuel; but this would take time. Then they contemplated buying the Palazzo Barberini or another large palace. This would cost money and they were no better off for money than for time. They considered it, therefore, most suitable to demand the Quirinal, and when Antonelli refused to give up the keys of this old *Palazzo apostolico*, they burst open the gate and took possession of it. In the hall of the Conclave, where the dove, as the symbol of the Holy Ghost, had formerly had its place, they hung the arms of the House of Savoy, and in other ways also they affronted at one and the same time both the sense of justice and religious sentiment.

The strong language which the Pope used in the encyclical *Rescriptes* with regard to his "imprisonment," which prevented him from executing his pastoral office with security and freedom,³ made a deep impression upon Catholics north of

¹ The despatch in Favre, 56. The despatch of the Count de Chaudordy from Tours of 25th October 1870 in Favre, 57f.

² *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 2nd and 6th November 1870.

³ "Declaramus et protestamur coram Deo et universo Orbe Catholico, Nos in

the Alps. These shared in fullest measure the Pope's indignation at "the shamelessness and hypocrisy of the Piedmontese government," which, as the encyclical said, went so far as to represent itself as the restorer of moral order in the papal provinces, although it was notorious to all that it promoted the spread of false doctrines and false worship, and gave loose rein to covetousness and impiety.

The breach in the walls of Rome evoked in Germany a cry of exasperation, and many German Catholics hoped that the victorious Prussian king would throw his weight into the scales for the benefit of "the prisoner in the Vatican." Archbishop Ledochowski of Gnesen-Posen was sent to the German headquarters with an address from his diocese,¹ which impressed upon King William "that the Papal States were the possession of Christendom, and that nobody could touch them without an atrocious violation of the rights of 200,000,000 of Catholics spread over the whole earth." On 8th November, Ledochowski came to Versailles. He was well received, but King William rejected Pius IX.'s offer of mediation between the contending powers, and did not answer the letter in which the Pope had suggested stopping the bloodshed by a temporary armistice of a fortnight.²

The Archbishop's visit afforded Bismarck occasion to express himself on the possibility of the Pope's departure. When Count Hatzfeldt said that it was in the interest of the Italians that Pius IX. should remain at Rome, Bismarck exclaimed: "Yes, it is true; but it may nevertheless be necessary for him to leave. But where will he go? He cannot go to France—Garibaldi is there. He has no inclination to go to Austria. To Spain? I have suggested Bavaria to him." After a moment's silence he continued: "He has no other choice than between Belgium and the north of Germany. We have, in fact, already been asked if we could grant him an asylum. I have, no objection to make to Cologne or Fulda. It would be an unheard of turn, but all the same not so inexplicable, and it would be rather advan-

ejusmodi captivitate versari, ut supremam Nostram pastorem auctoritatem tuto, expedite, et libere minime exercere possimus."

¹ Printed in the *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung* for 19th November 1870.

² Busch, 334. Favre, 59 and 63.

tageous for us to stand forth to the Catholic world for what we really are, viz.: the only power, which for the moment, can and will give protection to the Head of their Church. The Ultramontanes would thus lose every pretext for their opposition. Mallinckrodt would come over to the side of the government." Bismarck then further argued that the Pope's stay in Germany would be entirely free from danger. "We should look upon him as an old man who applied for help—as a good old gentleman who eats and drinks like others, takes a pinch of snuff, and perhaps even smokes a cigar. Well, even if some people in Germany went over again and became Catholics—I myself shall not do so—it would not much matter provided they became true Christians. It is not confessions that matter, but the faith. One must think more tolerantly."¹

While people both in and outside Rome were discussing the possibility of the Pope's departure, the Italian government found it very difficult to allay the impatience of the Radical Italians; they wanted to have St Peter's city turned in a moment into the capital of Italy. It was in vain that the government argued that Rome had not the necessary buildings for Parliament and the ministries. The Radicals could not or would not understand this difficulty. In order to throw somewhat of a damper on their agitation, the government issued a declaration that Rome was intended to be the King's capital, but that the change of residence could not take place before July in the following year.² Then Radicalism began to demand that Victor Emmanuel should at once make his entry into the future capital. Most of the ministers considered it more decent to postpone the royal entry, until the new Parliament had given its consent to the annexation of Rome—all the more so because the Pope had threatened to leave Rome on the same day that "the Piedmontese king" entered the city. Sella, the Minister of Finance, however, made himself the spokesman of impatience in the ministry itself, and Victor Emmanuel was consumed with the desire to enter Rome. But La Marmora averted for the time being the fulfilment of the King's desire by threatening to retire from his post if the King were to make his entry at once.

¹ Busch, 337f.

² Tavallini II, 52f.

Sella thereupon resigned. As soon as it was reported at Rome, the Romans issued a manifesto asserting that Sella's withdrawal from the ministry would be a testimony that it had become "reactionary," and it was proposed to elect the Minister of Finance at the coming election as the representative of the city of Rome. But Sella declined this honour and circumstances very soon arose which made it possible to solve the question of entry to the satisfaction both of the King and of the ministry.

On 5th December 1870, Victor Emmanuel opened the new Parliament at Florence with a speech in which he declared amidst deafening applause that he had fulfilled his promise, and finished his work by taking Rome for his capital. "Italy is now," he said, "free and united; our task is to make it great and happy." In virtue of "the national right," the Italians had entered Rome; they would remain there, but they would not forget the fulfilment of their promises to maintain the liberty of the Church and the independence of the Papacy.¹

A week after the opening of Parliament Rome was visited by a fearful disaster. The Tiber overflowed its banks, and inundated a large part of the city. The ministry considered that it would be most proper under such circumstances for the King to go quietly to the much tried town and take part in the work of relief. Victor Emmanuel was at once willing to do this, and on 31st December, at four o'clock in the morning, he arrived in the city with Lanza, Visconti-Venosta, Sella, and Gadda, the new Minister of Public Works. La Marmora, Prince Doria, and all the civil and military authorities of Rome were present at the railway station, and the Piazza di Termini and the way from the Porta Pia to the Quirinal were lighted by torches and filled with a crowd, which loudly expressed their joy at seeing the King amongst them. As soon as Victor Emmanuel had set foot on Roman soil, he sent his aide-de-camp, the Marquis Spinola, to the Vatican to pay his respects to Pius IX. But the Pope refused to receive the King's representative. Spinola was received by Antonelli, however, with exquisite courtesy, and the Cardinal

¹ Tavallini II, 55f. Rattazzi II, 364f.

said that he was to express his thanks on behalf of the Pope for the attention shown to him.¹

The year 1871 awakened at its beginning bright hopes in the Vatican. The establishment of the new German empire called to life memories of the expeditions of the mediæval emperors to Rome. The Emperor William, a month after the proclamation in the mirror gallery at Versailles, received an address from German Catholics, which expressed the hope that one of the first acts of the Imperial wisdom and justice would be to restore the temporal power to the Pope.² German Ultramontanism had overlooked the fact that the new Empire was Protestant; it soon came to feel it. The election of Thiers as President of the French Republic was greeted with joy at the Vatican. It was stated that the majority of the French National Assembly had been won over for the temporal power of the Pope, and it was expected that France would be the centre of an effective European action, which Italy in the long run could not withstand. The Foreign Minister, Jules Favre, however, had at once to crush all the hopes of Ultramontanism, by saying that France highly valued the Pope's offer of mediation, and was willing to do anything to secure the spiritual independence of the Papacy; but as regards the temporal power, it must consider the *status quo* as being the only reasonable thing for practical politics.³

But as regards another point the Papacy found greater sympathy in France than with the other powers. Even before the occupation of Rome there seems to have been a tacit agreement between several of the powers, that if Rome became the capital of Italy they would abolish the embassies to the Pope, and let the ambassadors to the Kingdom of Italy be likewise representatives at the Vatican. Some thought of choosing some ecclesiastical personage or another as their representative at the Vatican. Antonelli, however, declared that Pius IX. must oppose the former mode of action and decline the latter; and in this Favre was in agreement with the Papal Secretary.⁴ He considered that he ought to do everything to maintain official

¹ Massari, 53of.

² Cp. the author's essay on *Kulturkampen i Tyskland* in his *Karakteristiker og Kritiker*, 158f.

³ Favre, 64f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 78f.

connexion with the Vatican as far as possible, and he clearly saw the dangers which might arise, especially after the proclamation of Infallibility, if an ecclesiastic were to be the representative of the French State. Such an one would always be tempted to sacrifice political considerations to dogmatic ones. He sympathised therefore with the wish of the Vatican to have special embassies which were not theological.

At that time also a plan was suggested for the holding of a conference by the Roman Catholic powers, in order to secure the position of the Papacy as against Italy. Gladstone had formerly proposed such a conference; Von Beust now took up the idea, and several of the Vatican diplomatists approved of it. Scenes occurred at Rome from time to time, which almost drove the Pope to appeal to Catholic Europe for help, and the papal nuncio at Munich, Mgr. Meglia, on hearing of the encroachment of the Italians at Rome, had become especially anxious for the summoning of such a conference. He had apparently won over Antonelli to his scheme;¹ but Favre dismissed the project. He declared that France was willing to receive Pius IX. with due reverence, if he wished to live in Corsica, in Paris, or in Algiers. But France could not take part in an European conference. Such a conference could not possibly do anything but insist on the *status quo*, and when the Papacy protested against this, the conference would be immediately broken up. If such a political conference were to discuss the relations between the Papacy and the Kingdom of Italy, the diplomatists would moreover at every moment run the risk of entering upon questions, which they would be obliged to declare themselves incompetent to deal with. The only subject suitable for an international discussion was the condition of those religious institutions, which were under the guardianship of foreign powers. Antonelli also soon realised that the most probable result of a conference would be a general sanction of the proceedings of the Italian government; and the thought that the Italians' modern *aspirazioni nazionali* would probably be placed on the same footing as the ancient claims and rights of the Papacy, shocked Pius IX. The project of the conference was therefore quietly dropped.

But the relation of the Papacy to Italy was bound to be

¹ Favre, 84f.

defined. A Concordat might seem to offer a natural solution of the present difficulty. Rome, however, with recent disappointments¹ fresh in its memory, was very pessimistic with regard to the value of Concordats, and the Italian policy, after 1848, which aimed at a complete separation between State and Church, and demanded full religious liberty, made the conclusion of a Concordat, with its *do ut des*, impossible. Another way needed to be found.²

Some who, like Ricasoli,³ perceived that the days of old Rome were past, but who expected that the Papacy in the new era would reveal new forces and avoid the old collisions with the secular power, preferred that two new laws should be made: one concerning the Pope, but probably only of transitory importance, because in the new phase the Papacy would find a new basis for its independence and liberty; another granting Italy the greatest possible measure of religious freedom. Others—and this was the position taken up by almost the whole ministry and the majority in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Senate—were of opinion that the difficult problem could best be solved by a law of guarantee, which would secure at the same moment independence to the Pope and religious liberty to Italy. A few, such as Gino Capponi,⁴ found it difficult to reconcile themselves to the occupation of Rome, chiefly because all difficulties with regard to securing the Pope's independence "began," according to them, "at the gates of Rome." But most of the Italians who had been within the magic ring of the national movement, maintained that Victor Emmanuel by occupying Rome had, in fact, only asserted "the national right" of Italy as against the last remnant of the Middle Ages in the Peninsula.⁵ They

¹ See p. 378.

² "Come potrebbe l'Italia disdire tutto il suo passato, disdire una politica, cui deve la sua grandezza," wrote Lanza in January 1879 with regard to an Italian Concordat; Tavallini II, 59.

³ Ricasoli X, 202f.

⁴ Reumont: *Gino Capponi*, 350f. Cp. F. Scaduto: *Guarentigie pontificie* (Turin 1884), 89.

⁵ This is the view, for instance, of Carlo Cadorna in his great work: *Religione-Diritto-Libertà* (Milan 1893) II, 1117: "L'Italia, usando del suo diritto naturale nazionale, non fece altro si non applicare anche al potere temporale del Papa in Roma il principio della Rinascenza, che è la negazione del preteso principio medioevale."

could not, however, close their eyes to the fact that the Pope, as Lanza said, was "an international being," and that the necessity for the temporal papal power was to many diplomatists a political dogma. When the Pope's temporal power was destroyed, most Roman Catholic statesmen could only think of three possibilities, but little acceptable to most of them: either, that St Peter's successor would hereafter have to "travel about homeless like an exalted beggar, threatening the peace of the community wherever he took up his quarters"; that he would sink to be the court chaplain and almoner of the King of Italy; or that he would become a prisoner at Rome.¹ Therefore, even if consideration for the welfare of Italy should counsel a clear and decisive separation of State and Church, consideration for the rest of Roman Catholic Europe called for an unravelling of the tangle in church politics which would be less assailable in principle, namely, by a law of guarantee which should give security to the Roman Catholic governments and nations, that the destruction of the Pope's temporal power would not be synonymous with the spiritual thralldom of the Church. Ultramontanism and political Radicalism would—for diametrically opposite reasons—be averse to such a law. But both Liberal Catholicism, which had in Italy prominent and influential advocates, and political Liberalism which at that time was still able to hold its own against Radicalism, would be obliged, partly from patriotism, partly from prudence, to unite in adopting that way.

The Lanza ministry, therefore, brought in a Bill for such a law of guarantee;² and after debates, sometimes very stormy ones, lasting for months, the Bill was passed with some alterations in particular points.³ According to the *Legge delle Guarentigie* of 13th May 1871,⁴ the Pope's person is sacred and inviolable, and crimes against him are punished in the same way as crimes against the majesty of the King; but "discussion on religious subjects shall be perfectly free." The

¹ Minghetti: *Staat und Kirche* (Gotha 1881), 240f.

² Tavallini: *Lanza* II, 61f.

³ Scaduto: *Guarentigie Pontificie*, 81f. Rattazzi, 395f.

⁴ Printed in Scaduto amongst the documents, p. 72f. Its full title is: "Legge per le guarentigie delle prerogative del Sommo Pontefice e della Santa Sede e per le relazioni dello stato colla chiesa."

Italian government undertakes to show to the Pope the same tokens of honour as to other sovereigns, and to allow him the precedence assigned to him by Roman Catholic sovereigns. The Pope shall have the right of keeping the usual number of papal guards for the defence of his person and his palaces. There will be paid to him annually 3,225,000 *lire*, and a sum of the same amount will also be due for payment when the papal see is vacant. This yearly payment is free from any communal or provincial taxes, and it may not be diminished, even if the Italian government should afterwards decide to take over the expenses of the Vatican museums and the Vatican library. The Vatican, the Lateran, with all the adjoining buildings, gardens, and plots of ground, as well as the palace at Castel Gandolfo, are to be at the Pope's disposal, and these properties can neither be taxed nor alienated. When the papal see is vacant the cardinals may freely assemble; and the government will take care that neither the Conclaves nor ecumenical councils are in any way disturbed. No Italian officials may enter the papal palaces during a Conclave or a Council, unless the Pope, the Conclave, or the Council has given permission, and it shall be forbidden to make domiciliary visits, or to confiscate papers, books, or registers in the papal offices and congregations, which are exclusively engaged in spiritual work. The Pope shall have full liberty to exercise all the functions of his office, and to post notices belonging to his office on all the Roman church doors. The Church's officials shall be protected by the civil authorities, and foreign clergymen in Rome shall enjoy the same personal securities as the citizens of Italy. The ambassadors of foreign powers to the Pope shall possess the rights and immunities which, according to international law, are due to diplomatic agents, and the same shall be the case with the papal envoys to foreign governments. The Pope can, without the least hindrance, enter into communication with the episcopate, and with the whole Catholic world. He may also have his own post-office and his own telegraph; all papal postal matters and telegrams that are forwarded by the Italian State are exempted within its boundaries from any charge. In Rome and in the suburban dioceses all seminaries, academies, and colleges for the education of the clergy shall be subject solely to the

Holy See, without the slightest interference from the Italian government.

After the section dealing with the prerogatives of the Pope and the Papacy, several important provisions follow concerning the relation between State and Church. The members of the Catholic clergy shall enjoy full liberty of meeting. The government disclaims the right to appoint, or to make suggestions as to appointing to the higher ecclesiastical offices in Italy; and the Italian bishops shall not be required to take the oath to the King. All benefices outside Rome, higher and lower, with the exception only of the suburbicarian bishoprics (the sees which give titles to cardinals) can only be granted to Italian citizens. No alteration shall be made with respect to the benefices, of which the King is patron. *Exequatur*, *Placet regium*, and all other forms of government permission for the publication and execution of the decisions of the ecclesiastical authority, shall be abolished; but so long as no further provision is made by a new law, all the decisions of the ecclesiastical authority, as far as they concern the property of the Church and induction to the temporalities connected with the higher and lower church offices (except benefices in Rome and the cardinal dioceses), shall be subject to the *Exequatur* and the *Placet regium*. No bishop or priest, therefore, outside Rome and the cardinal dioceses, will be able to enjoy the emoluments of his office, before his election is sanctioned by the Italian government. Finally, new laws are also promised as to the preservation and administration of the church property in the kingdom.

This "law of guarantees" was, as it was expressed on several sides, amongst others by Minghetti, wholly and entirely a work of political opportunism. The Italian State thereby defined certain limits for its acts and its legislative power, in order to reconcile the Papacy with the new order of things. The defenders of the "law of guarantees," like Bonghi,¹ for example, strongly emphasised the magnanimity of the Italian government, which was shown in its great consideration towards a hostile institution such as the Papacy at

¹ Cp. his article in the *Revue des deux mondes* for 1st May 1873, which was intended to guide other nations, especially France, to the right understanding of the law.

that time must be said to have been. Although it was at once pointed out, from many quarters, that the law had only a temporary value, it was afterwards (19th February 1878) by a declaration of the Council of State, incorporated amongst the fundamental laws (*leggi fondamentali*) of the State. But the Italians have strongly insisted, that it is only an Italian law, not an international compact, and this is generally acknowledged.

Enthusiasm for the new law was nowhere great. Attention was at once called to the fact that it contained serious ambiguities. People asked the question,¹ Will the Kingdom of Italy really for instance permit the Pope to receive ambassadors from the deposed King of Naples or from Don Carlos? Or is the Italian government to decide who shall be allowed to send representatives to St Peter's successor? In this case, a serious restriction would undoubtedly be made with regard to the Pope's sovereignty, and he would be placed under the diplomatic tutelage of a foreign power. Further will the Italian government in all cases really undertake to consider everybody, who is sent to or from the Pope, as extra-territorial? Suppose that an Italian bishop is condemned to be imprisoned because he sets the laws of the State at defiance, will such a bishop be able to escape from the carrying out of the sentence, supposing he is charged with a mission to the Pope? The foreign diplomatist who is accredited to the Vatican lives in a place which is subject to the sovereignty of the King of Italy. Suppose the Pope might wish to treat with such a diplomatist concerning means to restore the temporal power of the Papacy, such plots would be hatched on the territory of the Italian government. Would this government in all cases be a calm spectator of plans and machinations which might threaten its whole activity? On the other hand, it was argued on behalf of the Papacy, that an independence, based upon a law which is subject to a Parliament composed of enemies of the Church, could only be a sham. To all the adherents of the Papacy the occupation of Rome was and continued to be, as Manning

¹ Fr. von Holtzendorff in the *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Rechtspflege des deutschen Reiches* (Leipzig 1876) IV, 308f.

expressed it,¹ "a crime against public morals," and Perrone's doctrine of the absolute necessity of the temporal power had passed into the very constitution of all Ultramontanes.

Nobody, moreover, could expect that Pius would acknowledge the "law of guarantees." A couple of days after the Italian occupation of Rome Antonelli said to Bonghi: "The Church alone has right on her side. Between respect for, and violation of, right there is no middle path. If the Church were to seem partially to give up the right, it would appear as if she gave it up completely, as if she herself no longer believed in the right."² The Papacy maintained this standpoint with an energy and a clearness which no one can help admiring. And neither Pius IX. nor Leo XIII. has been willing to accept the annual sum secured to them by the "law of guarantees."

As early as 25th November 1870, Antonelli in a note rejected the Italian government's offer of guarantees, and protested against the confiscation of those Italian papers which had ventured to print the Encyclical of 1st November.³ The Cardinal saw in such confiscations the best testimony that all guarantees would in reality be useless. During the following period the papal secretary issued one protest after another. On 12th December he complained in a note of the violence employed on the Piazza of St Peter's, and at other places in Rome, against faithful Catholics, who had assembled at St Peter's on 8th December, when a papal decree elevated Joseph, the foster father of Jesus Christ, to be the Patron of the whole Church (*Catholicæ ecclesiæ Patronus*), and made St Joseph's Day a feast of the first rank (*festum duplex primæ classis*), though without an octave. On 24th January 1871, Antonelli in another note expressed the Pope's indignation, that the Crown Prince Umberto and the Crown Princess (a grandchild of the pious King John of Saxony) had on the previous day entered the Quirinal, and had allowed themselves to be cheered by the people on the balcony, from which the election of a new pope had so often been announced to the Catholic world.⁴ On 2nd March, Pius IX. himself, in

¹ Purcell II, 461.

² *Revue des deux mondes* for 1st May 1873, p. 118.

³ See above, p. 400.

⁴ Stepischnegg I, 410f.

a letter to Cardinal Patrizi, his own vicar-general, and Dean of the College of Cardinals, protested against any idea of guarantees as a mixture of absurdity, subtlety, and derision.¹ On the same occasion, he complained that people represented him as being quite dependent upon the Jesuits. He acknowledged that out of regard to the tried experience and zeal of Loyola's disciples he often asked their advice, but he dismissed it as a shameful calumny, when his enemies spoke of his servile deference (*servile obsequium*) to the mighty order. But the belief in Jesuit influence at the Vatican was not shaken either by the letter to Cardinal Patrizi or by the papal decree of 23rd March 1871, which made Alfonso de' Liguori a *Doctor ecclesiæ* on account of his moral doctrines, which were so nearly related to Jesuitism, and of his defence of the two favourite Jesuit dogmas of the immaculate conception of St Mary, and the infallibility of the Pope.²

Two days after the publication of the "law of guarantees" the encyclical of 15th May 1871³ came out with the official declaration that the "law of guarantees" was only a new and unheard of form of sacrilege (*nova et inaudita sacrilegii forma*), and that the so-called guarantees of the Piedmontese government were by no means sufficient to give St Peter's successor the independence and liberty necessary for the government of the Church. The temporal power which divine providence for more than eleven centuries had granted to the see of St Peter could not be given up without the Pope coming under the supremacy of a temporal sovereign, and thus the most serious difficulties would arise, if that sovereign were to be a heretic, to persecute the Church, or to go to war with other sovereigns. Besides, the word "guarantee" itself contained clear testimony, that it was intended to impose laws upon the Pope—the Pope to whom God has given the power to make laws concerning morals and faith, the Pope who is to be the interpreter throughout the world of natural and divine right! And the laws, under which it was intended to

¹ "Nescias num primas teneat absurditas, an versutia, an ludibrium."

² See I, p. 98f.

³ Printed in Latin and in a French translation amongst the documents in Favre, 404f.

place the Pope, could not be executed except by the will of the secular powers and the decisions of lay people. "Ye know full well, venerable Fathers," it continues, "that we in the Blessed Peter (*in persona Beatissimi Petri*) have received direct from God (*ab ipso Deo directe*) all the prerogatives and the whole authority required for the government of the Church. These prerogatives and this authority are, like the liberty of the Church, won by the blood of Jesus Christ, and are as precious as that blood." It would therefore be a sin against the blood of Christ if the Pope were to receive from an earthly sovereign, in a diminished and distorted form moreover (*diminuta ac turpata*), the rights that were so dearly won. The wrong which is done to the Holy See is a wrong to the whole of Christendom, and the preservation of the rights of the Apostolic See is of the greatest importance to the welfare of the Church and the liberty of all bishops. The encyclical concludes with the wish that the sovereigns of the earth would forget all internal strife and agree to restore its rights to the Holy See, and therewith full liberty to the visible head of the Church, and tranquillity to society at large, of which tranquillity it is so highly in need. For the fulfilment of that wish all patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops are to pray.

During this difficult period the good-will of France was the sole earthly comfort of Pius IX. Jules Favre had persuaded Count Beust to put pressure on the Italian senate, in conjunction with France, in order to get the original form of the law of guarantees freed from a few provisions which would be especially painful to Pius IX. It had originally been the intention to declare the collections in the Vatican public property, but through the representations of France and Austria that provision was left out of the law. These collections were the pride of the popes, and a brutal confiscation of them would have called forth the indignation of all Europe. In addition to this, "the papal imprisonment" would become a real imprisonment if Italy were to lay hands on the art treasures of the Vatican; for only through the museum was it possible to reach the papal gardens from the dwelling chambers of the Vatican. Since Pius IX. had fully determined that he would not set foot on the property of which he had

been robbed by the Piedmontese government, he would, if the museums belonged to the State, be precluded from walking in the fresh air. The myth of the Vatican imprisonment would thus receive new nourishment. This myth was already making its way through the world, and it obtained credence to such an extent that in some places straws were sold from the bundles on which Pius IX. lay in the Vatican prison.¹

France did the Pope an almost greater service than this intervention during the debates on the law of guarantees, by appointing Count d'Harcourt, a son of the former French ambassador at Rome, as ambassador to the Vatican. Jules Favre ordered the new representative to turn a deaf ear if Pius IX. attempted to draw from him definite declarations as to help and support from France towards regaining the temporal power. Count d'Harcourt might, on the other hand, speak straight out to Antonelli. He might tell him that most Frenchmen wished to see the Pope in possession of temporal power, but that France would not do anything whatever to procure it for him, and that it would be a crime to advise France to do so.² On 26th April D'Harcourt was received at the Vatican. On his way thither from the Palazzo Colonna he was greeted with reverence by all who were friendly to the Pope, but he was also from the other side the object of a curiosity which, according to himself, "in certain quarters approached ill-will." When D'Harcourt had presented to Pius IX. his credentials from Thiers, and expressed the sympathy of France for a power which had suffered as much as his own hardly-tried country, and also warm thanks for the Pope's sympathy, Pius IX. replied. "The whole world," he said amongst other things, "is concerned that Rome shall not remain in the condition in which it now is. You have difficulties at present which do not leave you full freedom of action. I will not ask for more than I may. I only wish that your government would give the Italian Cabinet good advice, that it would appeal to it to move forward slowly, to avoid hasty measures, and not to enter paths which might easily prove dangerous. A final arrangement at Rome is being attempted by force and might, but a thousand reasons testify that Rome can never become their capital. The future will

¹ Tavallini II, 92.

² Favre, 104f.

show what is God's will. The present times are not propitious for regaining our sovereignty; I know that better than anybody else. All that I wish for is a little corner where I can be master. Even if people offered to restore to me my dominions I would say: 'No, thank you;' but as long as I have not that little corner, I shall not be able to perform my spiritual work in its full extent."¹

Jules Favre rejoiced at the Pope's moderate language, and especially that for once he had spoken of the "Italian" government, and not employed the usual word "Piedmontese." But when he was informed of what Count d'Harcourt had said in his introductory speech, he mildly blamed the ambassador because he had departed from the absolute reserve imposed by the circumstances.² Afterwards, D'Harcourt took up, in Favre's view, a perfectly correct position and worked in concert with the Austrian ambassador, who had received similar instructions to maintain the strictest reserve.

Barely a month after D'Harcourt had had the above-mentioned audience at the Vatican, melancholy reports were received from Paris. Archbishop Darboy and five other clergymen were thrown into prison as hostages of the Commune, and on 24th May all six were shot.³ This martyrdom evoked deep feeling at the Vatican. Darboy, as the story of the Vatican Council has shown, was one of the prelates who, by his action during the Council, had caused Pius IX. and the Jesuits the greatest trouble; but he had long been reconciled with the Papacy. As early as 25th July 1870, on his return to Paris, in a speech to the clergy of Paris, he had made the first steps towards a retreat.⁴ On 2nd March 1871, after a five months' seclusion from the rest of the world through the circumstances of the war, he sent Pius IX. a letter, in which, without reservation (*purement et simplement*), he declared his adhesion to the Vatican decrees.⁵ When

¹ Favre, 107. Odo Russell wrote on 1st October 1870: "After the occupation of Rome [the Pope] appears to have told some diplomatists that he was beginning to think it was God's will that the temporal dominion should cease." Purcell II, 464.

² Favre, III.

³ Foulon: *Vie de Mgr. Darboy*, 531f.

⁴ Ollivier II, 376f.

⁵ Foulon: *Darboy*, 502f.

Pius IX. received the news of his sad death, he is reported to have said: "He has washed away his errors by his blood, and put on the martyr's robe."¹

At a still earlier date Mgr. Maret had declared his submission to the decrees to which he had offered so much resistance, and in the course of 1871 Pius IX. had the satisfaction of seeing that nearly the whole episcopal opposition gave in. On 28th October 1870 Dupanloup in a pastoral letter compared the battle in the Council with earthly wars, but showed likewise that that battle was far above these others, because the question was not of personal triumphs, but of "the victory of the faith and of God."² This hint of retreat was understood by all. Archbishop Lyonnet of Albi hastened to quote "the beautiful words" in a pastoral letter to his priests, and Cardinal Lavigerie of Algiers, who, according to Pius IX.'s own words, had behaved "like an angel" at the Council, expressed his delight at "the meek and peaceable" adhesion of the Bishop of Orléans to the dogma which he had so unwillingly seen proclaimed.³ In February 1871 Dupanloup sent a letter to Pius IX. from Bordeaux which, in well-sounding phrases, announced that, without paying heed to the cries uttered by the enemies of the Church and of the Papacy, he was happy to be able to hope that it would be some consolation to the Pope in his sorrow when he declared that he made his submission.⁴ Recantations then followed in quick succession.

On 11th August 1870 Antonelli had sent a note to the papal nuncio at Brussels, in which he declared that the constitution of 18th July 1870 did not require to be published in any other way in order to be binding upon the whole Catholic world.⁵ It is not clear why this note was sent. Some think that it was to relieve the Belgian bishops from the necessity of publishing the Vatican decrees, which might easily, under the existing circumstances, involve the Belgian Catholics in difficulties;⁶ others have under-

¹ Purcell II, 468.

² Lagrange: *Dupanloup* III, 165.

³ Baunard; *Le Cardinal Lavigerie* (Paris 1898) I, 313. Lagrange III, 164.

⁴ Lagrange III, 166; he must be supplemented by Ollivier II, 381f. who does not pay the same regard to the good name of the Bishop of Orléans as the admiring biographer.

⁵ Friedberg, *Aktenstücke*, 625.

⁶ On 3rd July the D'Anethan ministry came into power.

stood Antonelli's note as a disguised request to publish the new dogma, although it was the custom that a Council's decisions were not published until the Council was ended.¹ Archbishop Melchers of Cologne at once understood the hint from Rome. He invited the German bishops to a meeting at Fulda on 30th August, in order to discuss what steps were suitable to be taken in view of the opposition to the Vatican decrees, which found voice in Germany; but of the twenty-four who had the right to be present, only nine appeared. Bishop Hefeled gave as his excuse for being absent that the bishops of the minority at Rome had agreed not to promulgate the decrees of the Council without previously discussing the matter together. But the bishops assembled at Fulda—amongst them Scherr, Ketteler, Senestrey, and Kremenetz—"could not remember that such an agreement had been made."² The pastoral letter from Fulda was afterwards signed by several German bishops who had not been present at the meeting beside the grave of St Boniface; but Deinlein of Bamberg, Beckmann of Osnabrück, Förster of Breslau, Hefeled of Rottenburg, and the Saxon Bishop Forwerk, who all belonged to the opposition at the Council, would not sign.

The pastoral letter which was drawn up at Fulda, asserted that, according to the precepts of morality and the canon laws, steps ought to be taken against those Catholics, and especially against those priests and teachers who would not submit to the decrees of the Vatican Council, though with long suffering and clemency and after previous exhortation. This utterance made a painful impression in many places in Germany, and at the end of September 1870, prominent Catholics from Bonn, Breslau, Coblenz, and Cologne met in the "Golden Star" at Bonn. They agreed upon an address to the bishops who had not yet submitted, requesting them to take united action. The document was sent to Rauscher, Schwarzenberg, Deinlein, Hefeled, Strossmayer, and Greith (of St Gall).³ It became

¹ Cp. J. F. von Schulte: *Der Altkatholicismus* (Giessen 1887), 108.

² "Keiner der unterzeichneten Bischöfe wusste sich zu erinnern (!) dass eine derartige Vereinbarung zu Stande gekommen sei." This declaration is clearly contradicted in a letter which Hefeled sent to Döllinger on 14th September 1870; it is printed in Schulte, 223.

³ Schulte, 112f.

evident from the answers received, that Rauscher, Schwarzenberg, Deinlein, and Greith had already submitted,¹ while Hefele and Strossmayer still maintained the same position as at the Council.²

But Hefele, likewise, soon submitted. On 10th August 1870, he had sent Döllinger a letter, in which he declared that he would *never* submit to the new dogma without some modifications to which the majority at the Council had been unwilling to agree, and that he would deny the validity and liberty of the Council, even if "the Romans" should suspend and excommunicate him, and set an administrator over his diocese.³ On 14th September he wrote again to Döllinger, and that letter says: "To acknowledge anything, which in itself is not true (*was an sich nicht wahr ist*), to be divinely revealed is a thing which those may do who can; I cannot do it (*non possum*)."⁴ On 3rd December, he declared in a letter to a priest, against whom Melchers had taken proceedings, that it was not for want of will in the hierarchy that fires were not lighted in the nineteenth century. He held out the prospect that he would himself answer with a *non possumus*, if submission were demanded of him; and that it would not weigh on his conscience, if for that reason he were subjected to an unjust censure.⁵ But on 11th March 1871, other sounds were heard from Rottenburg. Hefele then tells Döllinger that he will scarcely be able to endure the position of a suspended and excommunicated bishop.⁶ He has, therefore, only the choice between resigning his episcopal dignity and subjection; and it was evident from the letter that he meant to choose the latter way.⁷ He sent a letter of the same tenor to a friend at Bonn (was it Professor Reusch?), and when this friend answered, that a dogma in his eyes was something so great that he would rather sacrifice his life than deny a true dogma or subject himself to a false one,

¹ Their letters are to be found in Schulte, 237f., 247f., 208f., 265f.

² See Schulte, 223f., 251f.

³ "Mögen mich dann die Römer suspendiren und excommuniciren und einen Administrator der Diöcese bestellen." Schulte, 222.

⁴ Schulte, 223.

⁵ The letter in Schulte, 225f.

⁶ "Die Lage eines suspendirten und excommunicirten Bischofs scheint mir eine schreckliche, die ich kaum ertragen könnte."

⁷ Schulte, 228f.

the church historian at Rottenburg made the sad confession that the same had been the case with him—"until 1854."¹ With his subjection to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary Hefele's *sacrifizio dell' intelletto* had begun. On 10th April 1871, he too promulgated the new decrees at last, to the edification of those who considered that blind subjection to the Pope is better than obedience to the conscience—to the scandal of all those who had followed the learned bishop's action at the Council. These last could arrive at no other conclusion than that the Bishop of Rottenburg had submitted in order to preserve his episcopal see, and be at peace.²

Strossmayer still held out. Letters from him to Reinkens, Dupanloup, and Lord Acton³ showed that he would not submit, whatever others did. But "every man has his price." When the Bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium, ten years later, under Leo XIII., considered that he could serve the Slavonian cause by subjecting himself, he also made the desired *sacrifizio dell' intelletto*, and, on 28th February 1881, he issued a pastoral letter, "which," as the historian of Old Catholicism says, "must inspire every independent minded being with a feeling which one refuses to describe as it deserves."⁴ Döllinger died without submitting, but Père Gratry already, on 25th November 1871, from his death-bed at Montreux, had sent the Archbishop of Paris a letter informing him that he submitted to the decrees which he had formerly considered a misfortune.⁵

The submission of the bishops of the opposition was an encouragement to Pius IX. And he needed consolation, for yet more humiliations were awaiting him.

The "very reserved language" of the Emperor of Austria made a painful impression on the Vatican,⁶ and there was the greatest excitement there as to what would happen if the Italians carried out the threat of making Rome the capital of the new kingdom. Pius IX. might, perhaps, put up with the removal of the Italian Chambers to Rome; but it would pain him deeply if the ambassadors of foreign powers were to accompany the Italian government from Florence to Rome.

¹ Schulte, 230.

² *Ibid.*, 232.

³ *Ibid.*, 251f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 264.

⁵ Ollivier II, 380. Baunard: *Card. Pie II*, 470f.

⁶ Despatch of 23rd May 1871. Favre, 283.

The arrangement that the see of St Peter should retain the Leonine quarter of Rome as an ecclesiastical enclave had, not without the Papacy's own fault,¹ become impossible. Now through the fulfilment of the fatal cry of *Roma capitale*, the breach between the new kingdom and St Peter's see was about to be made still wider.

Field Marshal von Moltke had written in 1845 during his visit to Rome: "The future of Rome does not depend upon Rome herself, but upon the direction that religious development takes in other countries."² It cannot be denied that the Italian government, when it occupied Rome, and shut up the Pope in the Vatican, stirred up ill-will in nearly all the Roman Catholic part of Christendom; religious development abroad had not advanced so far that this deed of violence could be generally approved. There were still in Italy itself good nationally minded men who thought, like Gino Capponi, that it was a mistake on the part of the Italians to occupy Rome, and that it would be a still greater mistake to make St Peter's city the capital of Italy.³ It is intelligible that the Lanza ministry, in order to save the dynasty, and on account of certain popular sentiments in the south of Italy, should have given in to the cry for Rome as capital. This compliance, however, was not only a sign of the weakness of the government, but also of its injustice and imprudence, and it has been even more fatal to the happiness and peace of the new kingdom than to that of St Peter's see.

It might seem that Rome was as unsuited as possible to become a modern capital. Extensions and new buildings must constantly either be hindered by regard for the relics of the past, or conduce to Vandalism. A museum of world-wide renown cannot straightway be adapted for the residence of a modern sovereign and his Parliament, and an Italian king cannot fill the places, round which hover the memories of the Cæsars, of Gregory VII. and Innocent III. The connexion between *urbs* and *orbis* must of necessity be ruptured, when a national sovereign takes up his residence in the most inter-

¹ See above, p. 395.

² H. von Moltke: *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin 1892) I, 166.

³ A. von Reumont: *Gino Capponi*, 351. Cp. *Civiltà Cattolica*, Series XIII, vol. IV, 17f.

national place known to history. To this must be added the fact that Rome had not the surrounding country required by a capital, and that the climate of the town would be anything but healthy for the many officials, great and small, whom a residential city must always gather within it. And the removal of the capital and the ministries would involve expenses, which must further aggravate the depletion of the Italian treasury, whilst at the same time the degradation of Florence from a capital to a provincial town would cause the beautiful city on the Arno the most serious economical difficulties. But Rome was, as Rattazzi expressed it in a conversation with Victor Emmanuel, "an idea," and, if Rome did not become the capital, Naples would demand to become so.¹ Naples had a long history as the capital of a great kingdom, and possessed a splendid climate. But Naples as capital was to all the Italians of the north "the grave of Italy." In Naples the priestly party possessed a still greater power than in Rome; there were aristocrats there who longed for the good old days when there was no equality before the law, and Naples was full of political Lazzaroni, who would make a disagreeable and dangerous addition to the dregs of a modern capital. It was therefore necessary, as Rattazzi said, to put a good face on a bad business.² Menabrea, La Marmora, and Ricasoli agreed with Rattazzi, so Victor Emmanuel said. To give up Rome as the capital would, moreover, according to the opinion of these men, be the same as to invite Mazzini and Garibaldi to the town, so that it would become a hotbed of revolution, and a starting-point for a second Aspromonte.

It was, of course, pains wasted, when Jules Favre attempted to persuade Visconti-Venosta and the Italian government to be at least content with making St Peter's city the titular capital, while Florence continued to be the real one, and the seat of the government.³ The French Foreign Minister suggested that there should be in Rome only an Italian prefect by the side of the municipal council, as in the other great cities of Italy.

¹ Rattazzi II, 424f.

² "Bon visage à mauvais jeu, Sire; c'est le seul parti à prendre," he said to Victor Emmanuel in the conversation mentioned. Rattazzi II, 42f.

³ Favre, 125f. Rome was to have "une sorte d'honorat" which made it "la capitale de droit."

They would thus avoid having in the same place two institutions which would appear to exclude each other, and would on all occasions be likely to come into collision. They would thus also, as Favre expressed it, free Europe from a serious embarrassment, appease consciences, make reconciliation easier, and avoid causing unnecessary pain to a venerable old man. If the Italian government would not accept this suggestion, Favre advised in any case the postponement of the removal, which in itself was attended by a number of difficulties of various kinds, requiring time to overcome them. For a while he hoped to find a willing ear lent to his proposal at Florence. The members of the ministry were, as we have seen, by no means all equally eager for the removal to Rome, and the nearer the removal came, the more difficulties appeared. But on 8th June, the foreign governments suddenly received from the Cabinet at Florence a brief intimation that from 1st July onwards Rome would be the seat of the government.¹

It was now the business of France to find out what position the other powers, and especially Austria, would take up as to the removal of the embassies from Florence to Rome. On enquiring at Vienna, Jules Favre learned that Austria intended to let her ambassador move with the Italian Court to Rome. Although the Viennese Cabinet felt the difficulty of having two embassies in the same city—for Austria had also a representative at the Vatican—diplomatic tradition seemed to demand that the ambassador should follow the government to which he was accredited. In accordance with this tradition the foreign ambassadors in France had recently followed the French government from Tours to Bordeaux, and thence again to Versailles. Prince Metternich therefore told Jules Favre that Count Beust hoped that the French ambassador at Florence would also show himself at Rome on 1st July. This intimation caused Jules Favre much uneasiness; Cardinal Antonelli had hinted that such conduct on the part of Austria might bring upon the Austrian government the responsibility for making Pius IX. depart from Rome and from Italy.² It was difficult, however, for Beust to give the Austrian ambassador orders to the contrary. In order to get the Reichsrath to maintain the Austrian embassy

¹ Favre, 127f.

² Count d'Harcourt's despatch of 20th June 1871. Favre, 134.

at the Vatican, he had been obliged to promise that the Austrian ambassador at Florence should accompany Visconti-Venosta when he went to Rome.¹ Jules Favre had therefore to summon up all his diplomatic sagacity to find a way out of the difficulty which would offend no party. On 29th June he met Prince Metternich and Signor Nigra at one of Thiers' diplomatic banquets, and he there devised with them the following mode of dealing with the perplexing question. The French ambassador at Florence was to quit the town immediately (on leave), after transferring his duties to his *chargé d'affaires*, M. de la Villestreux, and on 7th July De la Villestreux was to go to Rome in company with the Austrian ambassador. Jules Favre was very proud of this solution of the diplomatic problem, by which he considered that he had done the Pope and Austria an essential service without offending Italy.²

While the diplomatists were occupied with this problem, Pius IX. was holding a great festival, because he had lived to see "the years of St Peter." The legend relates that the Apostle Peter was Bishop of Rome for five and twenty years.³ But none of the popes of Rome before Pius IX. had reached "St Peter's years." Pius VI., who reigned from 15th February 1775 to 29th August 1799, was the one of all his predecessors who had come nearest to this limit; Pius IX. overstepped it. It was related at Rome, that after the election of each pope it is said to him: "Thou wilt not live to see the years of Peter! (*annos Petri non videbis*)," and that Pius IX., when these words were addressed to him, muttered to himself: "That is no article of faith! (*Non est de fide*)." The words are not found, however, in any ritual for the Pope's coronation, and the answer ascribed to Pius IX. belongs to Benedict XIV., who is reported to have used that expression, when a monk once told him of the old prophecy, that no pope was to see "St Peter's years."⁴

On 4th June 1871, Pius IX. issued an encyclical, which promised plenary indulgence on the occasion of the forth-

¹ Favre, 138. Beust, 411f.

² Favre, 144.

³ Regarding St Peter's stay at Rome see Nielsen's *Haandbog i Kirken Historie* (2nd ed.) I, 106f.

⁴ Lucius Lector: *Le conclave* (Paris 1894), 673f.

coming festive season, and in this circular he enumerated all the signs of God's favour and all the trials he had experienced during his long papacy. June 16th was the great day,¹ and in 1871 the feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus fell also, curiously enough, on 16th June. Congratulations poured in from all parts of Christendom to the aged Pope, several accompanied by good Peter's pence, and the Romans of the papal party frequently gave vent to their feelings, to the great disgust of the opponents of the Papacy, who on several occasions scoffed at the foreign pilgrims who had come to Rome. The audiences commenced several days before the day of the jubilee itself. On that day Pius IX. received in the *Sala ducale*, amongst others, 800 German Catholics, priests and laymen, men and women; and he delivered a speech to them, in which he referred to the great difficulties and imminent dangers in Germany.² Two days later a French deputation was received, and to them also Pius IX. delivered one of those speeches, which revealed his large heart and his natural eloquence, but also his religious exclusiveness. In order to immortalise the unique festival there was built into the wall of St Peter's church, above the apocryphal statue of St Peter, a medallion in mosaic with the portrait of Pius IX. borne by two gilded bronze angels, and underneath it a marble tablet recording the festival, and informing posterity that the monument is the gift of the clergy of St Peter's.

Most of the sovereigns of Europe, and Thiers on behalf of the French Republic, sent their congratulations to Pius IX.³ Nor would Victor Emmanuel refrain, but sent General Bertolè-Viale with a present and the message, "that political dissension could not prevent his honouring the Pope as the visible Head of that religion which he professed, in loyalty to the traditions of his forefathers and to his own feelings."⁴ The General arrived at Rome on 15th June, and the next morning he drove with his aide-de-camp in full dress to the Vatican. The Swiss guard saluted him, and he was at once received by Antonelli, who promised to tell the Pope of the General's desire for an

¹ See above, p. 108.

² Gillet: *Pie IX.* (Münster 1877), 348f.

³ Thiers's letter in Favre, 121f.

⁴ Cappelletti: *Storia di Vittorio Emanuele III.*, 292f.

audience. Thereupon Bertolè-Viale drove back to his hotel. He there received an hour and a half later a letter from Antonelli, in which the Cardinal on behalf of the Pope expressed thanks for the congratulations, but regretted that Pius IX. was too much fatigued to see any more people. Count d'Harcourt professed to know that the Pope had told Antonelli to say that he accepted the good wishes, but "that circumstances did not permit of any other answer."¹ It was rumoured in Rome that Pius IX. himself had felt inclined to receive the King's representative, but that his intransigent entourage dissuaded him from doing so.²

When Pius IX. was surrounded by the admiring crowds and saw how the sovereigns of Europe paid homage to him, he could imagine himself back in the olden times. But the hard reality appeared every time he looked out of the Vatican windows, or thought of his summer residence at Castel Gandolfo. The crowning disaster, the sign that Victor Emmanuel had "eaten the last leaf of the artichoke" of the Pope's temporal power, was still to come. In the evening of 30th June Lanza and most of the ministers left Florence for Rome, and on Sunday, 2nd July, Victor Emmanuel made his entry into the new capital. When he received the homage of the Roman municipal council in the Quirinal, he uttered the famous words: "Now we are here, and here we will remain." But there was a large drop of wormwood in the cup of joy.³ There were certainly many Romans who shouted: "Long live the King! Live Italy!" But not a few preferred to cry: "Long live Pius IX.! Long live the Pope-King!" More and more of the Romans were beginning indeed to understand that the international glory of Rome would in some degree vanish when the city became the capital of Italy. The ambassadors of France and Austria were not the only ones who were conspicuous by their absence. There were, moreover, in some French papers vehement articles against Italy; and the French Catholics began to move in favour of the prisoner who, with St Peter's years, had found a Mamertine prison in his own palace, like a new *S. Pietro in carcere*. The

¹ D'Harcourt's despatch of 17th June 1871. Favre, 122.

² Massari, 533. Cp. Cappelletti III, 294.

³ Rattazzi II, 489f.

French bishops placed themselves at the head of a new "spiritual" crusade for the liberation of the imprisoned Pope, and the French priests collected thousands of signatures to petitions to the government, begging that it would at least by diplomatic intervention give Pius IX. a hope and frighten Victor Emmanuel. Thiers exhorted Jules Favre to hold firmly to the policy of neutrality which he had hitherto followed; but a debate in the National Assembly was at length unavoidable. It took place on 22nd July. Thiers defended the French policy with regard to Italy and the Papacy, in a splendid oration in which, as many thought, he surpassed himself.¹ He especially uttered a warning against clanking the sword. If people want war, he said, to restore the Pope's temporal power, they ought to have the courage to say so; but, if they have not got that courage, they ought not to put everything in train for a war. That is done not only when war is declared, but also when war is made inevitable. Thiers uttered a warning against "further adventures," and advised France to apply all her powers to her own regeneration. He did not conceal his scanty sympathy with the dangerous idea of nationality, which had created a new Great Power in the Italian peninsula; but this Power was now a fact. On the other hand, he maintained that the Concordat with Rome imposed upon all Frenchmen the duty of watching over the Pope's liberty and independence with the greatest conscientiousness.

Dupanloup, whom his own diocesan city had sent to the National Assembly,² spoke after Thiers. His speech was a variation upon thoughts which he had shortly before expressed in a pamphlet called *L'athéisme et le péril social*. It was an eloquent defence of the importance of religion to the commonwealth, and a powerful attack on the Commune, which had at first appeared in the name of liberty, but had at last persecuted and murdered those who believed in God. The religion which ought to be defended was to him, of course, the doctrine of the Roman Church; the centre of this doctrine is the Pope, and no pope without temporal power. At the same time that

¹ Printed in Favre, 317f. Cp. Favre's words about the speech, p. 149f.

² Lagrange III, 215f. Favre, 152f. Concerning the phrases and unreasonableness of this speech, see Ollivier II, 403f.

Dupanloup was passionately blaming Europe, because it had quietly looked on whilst Pius IX. lost his whole apostolic heritage, he gave free course to his indignation against Italy and its king. "It is impossible," he said, "that this can be the end of the greatness and beneficent action of the nineteenth century, that the successor of St Peter should be changed into a more or less ill-paid chaplain of Victor Emmanuel."

Dupanloup's speech made a great impression upon the assembly, and amidst the confusion which ensued, the leading members gathered their followers together to deliberate as to what should be done. Thiers spoke again, and thanked the Bishop for certain friendly expressions with which he had concluded, but at the same time he exhorted the assembly to be careful not to forget the dictates of prudence. After this, amid growing tumult, several proposals were made for an order of the day, and Thiers declared himself willing to accept one to the effect that the assembly, confident in Thiers's patriotism and prudence, passed to the next question.¹ Gambetta then spoke, and declared that he and his friends accepted this proposal. But Gambetta's words called forth a fresh storm.² The Right saw in his acceptance of the order of the day a testimony that this was only in favour of the Left, and a Roman Catholic Deputy shouted that the Right could not possibly vote for the proposal after Gambetta and his friends had declared themselves willing to do so. A fresh reply from Gambetta further increased the confusion and discord. The proposed order of the day was defeated, and the assembly decided instead, by 431 votes to 82, to refer the petitions of the bishops concerning the protection of the Pope to the Foreign Minister. Jules Favre saw in this a demand that a new policy must be adopted towards the Pope and Italy, and he therefore resigned his portfolio. After ten days' painful negotiations in the ministry, De Rémusat succeeded him.

This change of Foreign Minister awoke false hopes at the Vatican, and caused suspicion and unrest in the Quirinal. Victor Emmanuel was very indignant because Thiers had accepted the order of the day, and the coolness between the Quirinal and Versailles increased in the period which followed.

¹ Favre, 154. Lagrange III, 217.

² Favre's letter to Thiers after the stormy meeting. Favre, 333f. Cp. 158f.

But Italy did not allow herself to be stopped on her victorious path. On 27th November Victor Emmanuel gathered together the Italian Parliament for the first time on Monte Citorio, and in his speech from the throne he said: "We have proclaimed the separation of State and Church; and, after having acknowledged the complete independence of the spiritual authority, we consider that Rome, as the capital of Italy, can continue to be the peaceful and highly-honoured seat of the Papacy. We shall thus have the good fortune of pacifying people's consciences."¹ The speech, however, opened out likewise the prospect of certain laws concerning the property of the Church,² a reference which filled the Vatican with new anxieties. But in order to show Pius IX. and the Roman Catholic world that he still entertained reverence for the Pope's person, and for the Papacy as a spiritual power, Victor Emmanuel sent his adjutant-general on New Year's Day, 1872, to wish the Pope a happy New Year. The usual thing occurred, however. Pius IX. did not receive the adjutant, but Antonelli asked him to bear to his King the Pope's thanks for his good wishes.

Most of the men at the Vatican could only see in Victor Emmanuel a new Sennacherib or Heliodorus, but Pius IX. himself had moments in which it was difficult for him to forget that the Piedmontese king belonged to a race which had produced pious sovereigns, and had given saints to the altars.³ But there was no possibility of peace between the Vatican and the Quirinal. When Pius IX. spoke to answer the deputations and the crowds of pilgrims who paid him their homage and expressed their sympathy, he not infrequently used the most violent expressions about the Italian government. He called Victor Emmanuel and his counsellors thieves, hypocrites, children of Satan, and monsters of hell, and he characterised the leaders of the national Italian Press as "men who had

¹ The speech from the throne in Massari, 635f. Cp. Tavallini: *Giovanni Lanza* II, 83f.

² "Le proposte legislative che vi saranno presentate per regolare le condizioni degli enti ecclesiastici, informandosi allo stesso principio di libertà, non riguarderanno che le rappresentanze giuridiche, e la forma dei possedimenti, lasciando intatte quelle religiose istituzioni, che hanno parte nel governo della Chiesa universale."

³ Massari, 538f.

issued from the pits of hell."¹ And he often had experiences that might tempt him to use strong words.

On 27th October 1871, in an allocution to the cardinals, he had declared that he would fill the many vacant episcopal sees without paying any regard to the provisions of the law of guarantees as to what should be done under such circumstances. He thereupon appointed new men to the vacant sees, and they were considered by the faithful in their districts as rightful pastors; but since they would not apply for the *Exequatur* of the government, they received neither the palaces nor the incomes pertaining to their offices, and the government took no notice whatever of their activities. In order to procure daily bread for them, a Barnabas society was formed which collected money for them, and exhortations were issued from the Vatican that they should on no account apply for the *Exequatur* of the state, because such a step would contain an acknowledgment of the lawfulness of the Italian government.² But as the number of such bishops without incomes increased, the Barnabas money did not go so far, and several of the new bishops, who did not all approve in the same degree of the policy of the Vatican, began to cast longing looks towards the palaces which their predecessors had inhabited, and the handsome incomes which had enabled them to do good in far greater measure. The Vatican, however, issued a threat of *suspensio a divinis* if a bishop dared to give way to the temptation to submit to the law of guarantees, and as there was no prospect that the Pope and his counsellors would readily change their minds, several impatient politicians advised Lanza to do the same as Prussia, where the Falk era had been inaugurated. Lanza did not listen to these counsels, and the priest Don Bosco and others offered to mediate.³ When Lanza clearly perceived the peculiar difficulties that would follow upon a *Kulturkampf* on Italian soil, he was not unwilling to agree to

¹ Cp. Gladstone's essay in the *Quarterly Review* for January 1875 occasioned by the *Discorsi del sommo Pontefice Pio Nono, pronunziati in Vaticano ai fedeli di Roma e dell' Orbe dal principio della sua Prigionia fino al presente* I—II (Roma 1872f.). [The Essay is reprinted in Gladstone's *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion* (London 1875)].

² Stepischnegg I, 412f. Tavallini II, 92f.

³ Don Bosco's letter of 21st May 1872 is amongst the documents in Tavallini II,

some minor formal concessions, provided only the main thing—the presentation of the canonical appointment of the bishops concerned—was maintained. Thus by degrees this difficulty was successfully overcome, and a *modus vivendi* was found.

But there were plenty of difficulties at other points. It angered Pius IX. that an Italian Bible Society should be formed before his very eyes, which commenced its work in the streets of Rome. It offended him still more that first one and then another Protestant minister, taking advantage of religious liberty, set up his pulpit in the city of St Peter, where hitherto the Protestant service had only been tolerated in the Palazzo Caffarelli on the Capitol.¹ In one of his fiery speeches he called the Protestant ministers at Rome “teachers of iniquity,” who worked in “diabolical” halls.² The Vatican attached less importance to the abolition of the faculties of divinity in all the universities of Italy; for seminaries must, under the circumstances, be said to be safer places for educating those about to become priests than the high schools, whose teachers were appointed by the Piedmontese government. But when the Italian Minister of Justice, in November 1872, brought in the bills announced the year before in the speech from the throne, the anger of the Vatican knew no bounds.

For the new Bills purported to apply to Rome and the Roman province those laws for the dissolution of monasteries, and the sale of church property, which had long been in force in the rest of Italy.³ Ecclesiastical foundations and lay brotherhoods owned altogether 71,360 hectares out of the 203,000 hectares contained in the *Agro Romano*, that is to say, more than one-third. It is no wonder that a temporal government considered it dangerous that such large properties should be under “the dead hand.” The forced sale and the partial confiscation of these estates, which the government proposed, was attributed to regard for the economical development of Rome as the capital of the kingdom, and the necessity of counteracting the baneful influence of the Roman Campagna from a sanitary point of view.⁴ The government

¹ See above I, 365.

² *Discorsi* I, 340, quoted by Gladstone.

³ See above, p. 279.

⁴ Cp. Bonghi in the *Revue des deux mondes* for 1st May 1873, 132f.

also argued that even if Rome were allowed a larger proportion of monasteries than the remainder of the country, yet 474 (216 in Rome itself, 73 in the suburbicarian dioceses, 185 in the other communes of the province) must be considered far too great a number. And whilst the government needed buildings for public offices, many of these monasteries were of an altogether unreasonable size, which stood in no relation to the numbers of the inhabitants. There were at that time in Rome and in the province 8,151 monastic persons (4,326 monks, 3,825 nuns); but the monasteries and their ecclesiastical houses with their gardens and their vineyards, occupied one-fifth of the inhabited part of Rome itself, and they had, according to their own accounts, in Rome alone an annual income of more than 2,900,000 *lire* nett (more than 3,000,000 and a third gross); in the whole province 4,200,000 *lire* nett (4,700,000 gross).

These large revenues were a temptation to the lean Italian treasury, whose interest was looked after by men who in the most of these monks and nuns could only see lazy consumers, who did the state not the least good, but much damage. The Radicalism, which was more and more self-consciously lifting its head in the Italian Parliament, compelled the government to bring the older laws as soon as possible into force in the Roman territory as elsewhere. The watchword that proceeded from Pius IX. as to the parliamentary elections, *Nè elettori nè eletti!* made it impossible for a parliamentary government to enter on a more Conservative path, and the tension between the Vatican and the Quirinal constantly stirred up men's passions. The Lanza Cabinet did not hesitate therefore to put the Church in Rome on the same footing as everywhere else in Italy. Only towards the generalships of monastic orders, which are located in Rome, but govern orders spread throughout the world, it was necessary to take some heed, in order to avoid international difficulties. For these generalships, like the many ecclesiastical colleges in Rome, were not national, but international, institutions, and they required therefore to be treated with greater caution. Some subtlety in law was needed to make it possible to pay the necessary regard to foreign powers, without too openly putting weapons in the hands of the Radicals, when they complained that this

regard led to a violation both of the letter and of the spirit of the older laws.¹

These bills to those at the Vatican were, of course, simply robbery and plunder. On 23rd December 1872, Pius IX. held a consistory, in which he made a violent attack on the proposed law, which did not deserve to be called by the honourable name of law, because it was against natural, divine, and social justice. But the protest of the Vatican made no impression at Montè Citorio; the Mazzinians who, after their chief's death (11th March 1872), had become still wilder than before, considered on the contrary that the Bill was too accommodating and considerate, and Lanza put a nail in the coffin of his ministry when, in the name of the public peace, he forbade a popular meeting at Rome, which was to have discussed the proposed laws from a Radical standpoint.² The law concerning the dissolution of the monasteries and the transfer of church property was passed both by the Chamber of Deputies and by the Senate, and on 19th June 1873 it was confirmed by Victor Emmanuel. Pius IX. had to be thankful that a proposal made by Mancini to expel the Jesuits from the whole of Italy had already been rejected in the Chamber of Deputies by 179 votes to 157.³

But in the allocution of 23rd December 1872 the sting was not directed against the Piedmontese government alone and its new sacrilege. "Our bitter pain," said Pius IX., "is not a little increased by the remorseless persecutions to which the Church is exposed in other places also, especially in the new German empire, where men strive, not only by secret machinations, but openly, to destroy it by force to its foundations."⁴ It was to the German *Kulturkampf* that this strong language alluded.⁵

The tension between Berlin and the Vatican began in reality after the battle of Königgrätz. After the defeat of Austria the hegemony in Germany passed over to Protestant Prussia, and the last remnants of the traditions of the Holy Roman Empire

¹ Even Bonghi speaks of "une fiction juridique un peu subtile"; p. 134.

² Tavallini II, 97, where Lanza's defence against Cairoli's interpellation (12th May 1873) is to be found.

³ Stepischnegg I, 421.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 326.

⁵ As to the origin of the word *Kulturkampf*, see the essay in my *Karakteristiker og Kritiker*, p. 145f.

vanished. Bishop Ketteler was one of the first to perceive that Austria's defeat was the cause of great changes in many matters. At the beginning of 1867 he complained in a letter to the papal nuncio at Munich, that the Roman Catholic Church was "nearly everywhere" deprived of the defence and help of the secular arm.¹ It was, in fact, a highly revolutionary programme that Bismarck was carrying out when he shut Austria out of Germany, overturned three German thrones, and deprived a free city of its ancient independence. The problems that were set before the new German empire could only be worked out by the help of Liberalism, and Herr von Bennigsen was, therefore, summoned to Berlin immediately after the Franco-German war, *als Vertrauensmann*. The Roman Catholic Centre party, however, exercised a powerful force over many German subjects incorporated into Prussia, who sympathised with Austria, and over many Conservatives, who abhorred revolution, and who, on account of their local patriotism, were unable to join the Conservatism of Prussia. The adhesion of these elements, all hostile to Prussia, gave the central party a peculiar colour, and it seemed to many to stand in opposition to the national idea of unity.

Bismarck's alliance with Liberalism soon made itself felt in the home politics of the new empire. The Liberals, who to men like Bishop Ketteler were only "fanatics of impiety and infidelity," had on the battlefield of Königgrätz destroyed the stronghold of Ultramontanism, and thereby carried out the programme of Gotha, as far as foreign politics were concerned. They now wished to carry it out at home also, and to assert the "omnipotence" and unsectarian character of the State, as against the Roman Church and the political and ecclesiastical Conservatism which had been taught by Stahl. The partisans of the omnipotent State had come into power under very difficult circumstances, and it soon became evident how much the stiff German theologians were wanting in the practical wisdom that characterises the English. The German Liberal politicians were, moreover, incited to extremes by the *Non possumus*, which, just as they came into power, was hurled against everything that Liberalism wished for and fought for. The theory of German Liberalism with regard to the omnipotence of the

¹ *Briefe von und an W. E. Freiherrn von Ketteler*, 347f

State came into collision with the claim of modern Ultramontaniam for the omnipotence of the Church—with an ecclesiastical policy, which in its inmost essence was a re-establishment of the mediæval theory which had found its classical expression in the Bull of Boniface VIII., entitled *Unam sanctam*. The reason why the collision was so violent was that it happened at a time when the champions of the omnipotent State in Germany were intoxicated with victories and success, whilst the church party were crushed by their own defeats and the misfortunes of the Papacy; and the strong group at the Vatican, who were friendly to France, fanned the flame of strife, because Germany was not only the enemy of the Church, but also the enemy of France. It did not require much insight, however, to see who would in the end be defeated; it soon became evident that the German *Kulturkampf* was one of the greatest political mistakes which modern history knows of.

The strife began in Bavaria, the largest Roman Catholic state in the new German empire. The president of the Bavarian Council, Von Lutz, had adopted Döllinger's view of the significance of the dogma of Infallibility. Bavaria forbade the publication of the *Pastor æternus*, because this constitution would presumably make a serious alteration in the structure of the Roman Church, by changing the bishops into the obedient servants of the infallible Pope; and the Bavarian government promised to protect those priests and teachers who would not accept the new constitution. When Döllinger refused to submit to the new dogma,¹ his archbishop, on 17th April 1871, excommunicated him and his colleague, Professor Friedrich, Cardinal Hohenlohe's theologian,² and on Sunday, 23rd April, the excommunication of the two professors was solemnly proclaimed from the pulpit of St Ludwig's church.³ Archbishop Scherr of Munich-Freising, a prelate of little weight,⁴ received flattering letters from the Vatican,

¹ Cp. the correspondence between Scherr and Döllinger in *Briefe und Erklärungen von I. von Döllinger über die vatik. Decrete* 1869-87 (Munich 1890), 62f.

² See above, p. 325.

³ *Briefe und Erklärungen*, 100f.

⁴ "Scherr war ein schwacher Mann ohne jede tiefere Kenntniss; wer ihn einmal bischöfliche Pontifikalhandlungen hat vornehmen sehen, konnte sich nur fragen: wie ist's möglich gewesen, einen so jeder Würde entbehrenden Mann zum Erzbischof zu

and from many German and Italian bishops, for having taken this step, and the battle which had begun with the opponents of the new dogma, was continued by the deposition of less important men than Döllinger and Friedrich. But the Bavarian government supported the two excommunicated professors. The University of Munich, by 54 votes against 6, elected Döllinger Rector of the University; and when Justus von Liebig died in 1873, the King of Bavaria appointed the famous theologian to be his successor as President of the Bavarian Academy of Science. The excommunication of Döllinger and Friedrich gave the opposition to the new dogma fresh strength, and Germany saw a new division in the Church when the so-called Old Catholics began to organise themselves.

The ecclesiastical strife in Bavaria was not inopportune for Bismarck; for the relations of Prussia to the Vatican had become very cool after the Franco-German war.¹ The new German Parliament began its work with a debate on an address in answer to the speech from the throne. The majority had inserted a passage in that address which expressed the hope "that the time for interferences in the life of other nations would never return under any pretext or in any form whatever," and Von Bennigsen defended non-intervention in a speech in which he uttered a warning against any plans for attempting to get the new German empire to follow in the steps of the mediæval empire as regards Italian politics.² The Centre could not possibly vote for the proposed clause, since the Syllabus had reckoned the principle of non-intervention amongst the errors to be condemned. But the address was adopted in the form agreeable to the majority, and the Centre received its first notice of disapproval on 5th April 1871, in the official *Provinzial-Correspondent*.³ Other defeats followed later, and Bismarck became more and more irritated with the Roman Catholic politicians of the Centre. When it was reported that Cardinal Antonelli had disapproved of the behaviour of the Centre in the German Parliament, Bismarck himself declared

machen. Es war dem Nuntius und einigen fanatischen Domherren gelungen den armen Mann willenlos zu immer neuen Schritten zu treiben." Schulte: *Altkatholicismus*, 205.

¹ Cp. for the following my *Karakteristiker og Kritiker*, 159f.

² L. Hahn: *Geschichte des "Kulturkampfes" in Preussen* (Berlin 1881), 45f.

³ Hahn, p. 45f

that the report was true. Then Ketteler published a letter from the Cardinal, from which it appeared that Antonelli had only called the attempt of the Centre to bring about an intervention "premature"; and the papal Secretary of State expressed his regret that it should have been thought that the proceedings of the Catholic party in Parliament had been censured by him.¹

Bismarck felt himself personally aggrieved by this statement, and his new Liberal friends fanned his indignation by pointing out how the Centre was steadily growing larger by the adhesion of all "enemies of the Empire." The annoyance of the Prussian government towards the Vatican immediately showed itself in the protection which was shown to the Old Catholics, first in the schools and then in the Church. The Prussian Minister of Public Worship, Von Mühler, a Conservative and a definitely religious man, was carried so far that in spite of the protest of the Bishop of Ermeland and of many parents, he wished to force upon the Roman Catholic pupils of the gymnasium at Braunsberg a religious teacher, who refused to submit to the new dogma, and had therefore been suspended. As the Bishop of Ermeland found support from the rest of the German bishops,² Bismarck induced his King, by a royal order of 8th July 1871, to abolish the Catholic department of the Prussian Ministry of Public Worship, which, since the conflict concerning mixed marriages,³ had been the organ of the wishes of the Roman Catholic hierarchy towards the State.⁴

And this step was only an introduction to others of far greater range. In the reasons for the royal order of 8th July 1871 the cloven hoof of the theory of the omnipotent State already appeared, since it was propounded that the executive must take care that constitutional points of view were "exclusively and unconditionally" maintained in its relations with the Roman Church. In order to carry out such a policy with the requisite energy and freedom from scruples, it was necessary to provide a successor to Von Mühler, and such an one was found on 22nd January 1872, when Privy Councillor Dr Falk was appointed Minister of Public Worship. Von Mühler

¹ Antonelli's letter in Hahn, 49.

² The documents in Hahn, 52f.

³ See pp. 45, 78.

⁴ The order and the motives in Hahn, 49f.

resigned on 17th January; several days therefore passed before his successor was appointed. King William is said to have delayed signing the new minister's appointment for some days, because he distrusted Dr Falk's Liberalism. But various Liberal journals loudly demanded Dr Falk's appointment, and Germany obtained its "Edelfalk." The *Provinzial-Correspondent* accompanied the announcement of the change of minister with the statement that the new minister would watch over the inalienable rights (*unveräußerliche Rechte*) of the State, and the claims of the ethical and religious interests of the nation.¹

On 30th January the new Minister of Public Worship unfolded his programme of church policy in a debate upon the abolition of the Catholic department,² and after Windthorst had spoken, Bismarck himself came forward. He told the former Hanoverian minister that, for reasons which Bismarck could not but honour, he had "only unwillingly" joined the Prussian commonwealth; and he asserted at the end of his speech that Prussia was a state where all sects were equal, and that its government could not therefore take denominational action.³ This debate was a declaration of war against German Ultramontanism, and a week after the war broke out. On 9th February 1872 both Dr Falk and Bismarck spoke in favour of a bill for the supervision of schools, which Von Mühler had brought in, and heated words were once more spoken. Bismarck declared that the gentlemen of the Centre would more easily obtain peace with the State if they withdrew themselves from the leadership of the Guelphs; and on the following day he told the German bishops that Roman Catholic priests were everywhere patriotic except in Germany. When Windthorst reminded Bismarck of a speech he had delivered in 1849, he declared that just as he had then defended the true Christian faith against those who from barricades attacked the foundations of the State, so he would now defend this faith against those who attacked the foundations of the State from a quarter which seemed called upon to strengthen and not to shake them. The law regarding the supervision

¹ Hahn, 58.

² The speech in Hahn, 59f.

³ *Ibid.*, 60f.

of schools was passed with a few amendments, and there-upon the war was carried into another domain.

On 25th April the German representative at the Vatican, Von Derenthall, informed Cardinal Antonelli that the Emperor thought of appointing Cardinal Hohenlohe to be the German representative at the Curia, and that if Pius IX. were satisfied with the appointment, the Cardinal would immediately go to Rome and present to the Pope his credentials.¹ On 2nd May Antonelli answered that His Holiness regretted that he could not give his consent to one of the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church undertaking such a delicate and important office, especially considering the position of the Holy See at the moment.² This answer could not really surprise anybody. France, Spain and Portugal, it is true, had often sent cardinals as ambassadors to Rome, but those dignitaries did not belong, as Hohenlohe did, to the Roman Curia. Hohenlohe's palace had been one of the centres of criticism of the dogma of Infallibility, and the German cardinal was anything but a *persona grata* at the Vatican.³ The old Bavarian nobleman had fits of pride during which he looked down upon the Pope himself, and at Rome people had so little confidence in his sagacity, that it was feared that Bismarck, by giving him a shrewd secretary, might get him entirely into his power.

Bismarck was much put out at the refusal of the Vatican to receive Cardinal Hohenlohe as the representative of Germany, and ten days later (14th May) he revealed his plans towards the Vatican during the debate upon the Foreign Office budget. "After the recently pronounced and publicly promulgated dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church," he said, "it will not be possible for a temporal power to arrive at a Concordat with it, unless that power becomes 'effaced' to a degree, and in a manner, to which the German empire at any rate cannot consent. Do not be anxious! To Canossa we will not go either bodily or spiritually!"⁴ There was then to be war, but what were the weapons to be used? Laws! "There can be and must

¹ Von Derenthall's letter in Hahn, 71.

² Antonelli's answer in Hahn, 72.

³ Cp. Paul Vasili: *La société de Rome* (Paris 1887), 199, about a somewhat late time.

⁴ Hahn, 72f.

continue to be but one sovereignty," said Bismarck, "the sovereignty of the legislature! He who represents the laws of the country as having no binding power upon him thereby places himself outside the law and renounces the law." The aggressions of Rome where the old laws were insufficient were to be met by new laws.

At the first Congress which the Old Catholics held at Munich (September 1871), they had declared that the Jesuits were chiefly to blame for the confusion in the Church, and that the welfare of State and Church alike demanded that an end should be put to the baneful activities of that order. Afterwards the Liberal Protestant Union, under the presidency of Privy Councillor Bluntschli, passed a similar resolution at a meeting at Darmstadt, and after the affair of the embassy to the Vatican the so-called Jesuit Bill was proposed as the first specimen of the intended legislation.¹ The embitterment caused by this bill was intense. The whole German episcopate immediately took up the defence of the order of Loyola, and in Parliament the best speakers of the Centre came forward as its champions. "You have the army, the officials, the universities, all the schools, and 50,000 copies of those journals, which are indefatigable in slandering the Catholics and throwing mud at everything which they revere and bow to in reverence"—so Reichensperger cried to the government; but it was in vain. Bismarck kept himself in the background during this debate; he was taking a holiday. But Wagener, who during the absence of the Imperial Chancellor was a sort of commissary for the government, and the Liberal politicians, defended the bill as an expression of the self-defence of the German Empire against the Vatican. The bill was passed. An Imperial statute of 4th July 1872 banished the Jesuits, and the members of congregations akin to them (*e.g.* the Redemptorists), from the dominions of the German empire. The Ultramontanes had in vain sent a deputation to the Emperor at Ems to ask him to refuse to sanction the law; the deputation was not even received.

Then the Vatican rang the alarm-bells. *The Civiltà Cattolica*² called the new German Empire "a scourge of wrath in the hand of God," and it looked forward with joy to the day

¹ Hahn, 76f.

² See my *Karakteristiker og Kritiker*, 172f.

when the scourge should be broken in pieces and cast aside. The German Catholic Press spoke in the same strain. "By this," one paper wrote, "religious peace is shaken, and war is declared against a power older than the Burggraf of Nürnberg." The *Vaterland* at Munich wrote: "The Jesuits will certainly survive the German Empire with its Freemasons and its Jews. We do not value this German Empire of yours; we have never acknowledged it; it is to us only a passing storm-cloud." Pius IX. himself entered the lists, and in a speech to the German reading-club at Rome¹ he said, with an allusion to Daniel's vision: "Who knows whether the little stone from on high will not soon be loosened and crush the foot of the colossus."² Jewish and Christian journalists alike had so completely forgotten the lessons of their childhood that they were unable to understand the Pope's use of the prophetic image. Some thought that Pius IX. had meant Bismarck by the "Colossus," and the chancellor was so enraged at this speech that some Roman Catholic journals thought it best to suggest that Pius IX. in this case had spoken too much like an Italian.

Bismarck had evidently expected that an attack upon the Jesuits would meet with sympathy from many German Catholics. Not a few German bishops had now and again felt themselves somewhat oppressed by Loyola's disciples and by the tutelage of the *Civiltà Cattolica*; and it was no secret that several of them also had spoken bitterly during the Council about the Jesuit dogma-mongers at the Vatican. But this hostility was really only a passing mood. The *Jesuitenzöglinge* of the *Collegium Germanicum* on the episcopal thrones and in the seminaries had inculcated into all German priests, and through them into the Roman Catholic laymen in Germany, the Jesuit dogmatics and the church policy of the Jesuits. And after the Vatican Council the ultramontane theory of the relation between State and Church, which the German state absolutists were attacking, was more than a private opinion. It was acknowledged to have binding force for all children of the Roman Church.

The Prussian State soon felt this. The Bishop of Ermeland would not give way, nor acknowledge the Old Catholic master

¹ About its work and value see A. de Waal: *25 Jahre in Rom* 1870-95. (Frankfort, 1895), 25f.

² Hahn, 102f.

at Braunsberg as a proper teacher of religion, and the government sought in vain to force the obstinate bishop to say that he yielded to the omnipotence of the State. "I recognise the full sovereignty of the State in things of the State," was his utmost acknowledgment.¹ But this did not satisfy the government. It suspected a trick, a Jesuit *reservatio mentalis*, behind the words: *die volle staatliche Souveränität des Staats*. "By this sentence," said an Imperial document, "there is set over against the sovereignty of the monarch another sovereignty, which can only be imagined to be the ecclesiastical."² But the Bishop of Ermeland was not inclined to comply as to this point; state absolutism can only be recognised by those, who in every case will renounce the right to follow the maxim that we ought to obey God rather than men. But the Prussian ministry would not give way either, and it confiscated the Bishop of Ermeland's revenues, because, as was said, the government could not undertake the responsibility of paying the Bishop out of the funds of the State, to whose laws he would not unconditionally submit.³

De Tocqueville has called attention to the fact that the old *régime* in France had bequeathed to the revolution the forms through which it could work. If social democracy at any time gains the victory in Germany, it will be able to use successfully many of the forms created by the *Kulturkampf*. History may be searched far and wide before we find so reckless and so brutal a state absolutism.

When it was pointed out that the new laws directed against the Roman Church were contrary to a couple of paragraphs in the Prussian constitution, these paragraphs were amended without difficulty (on 5th April 1873),⁴ and thereupon the so-called May Laws were passed. The May Laws were provisional laws, but they went much further than the immediate occasion demanded. They rested on the supposition that the State not only has power, but is absolutely bound, to force unconditional obedience on all points without being stopped by divine or by human rights—"not even," as it was once said somewhat

¹ See his letter to the Minister of Public Worship of 15th June 1872, Hahn, 86f.

² Hahn 87f.

³ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁴ The law of 5th April 1873 in R. Höinghaus: *Die neuen Kirchengesetze in Preussen nebst den vollst. amtlichen Motiven und Kommissionsberichten* (Berlin 1873), 45.

cynically, "by reasons of morality." One "May-law" defined limits for the Church's use of discipline;¹ another instituted a supreme ecclesiastical court of eleven members appointed by the King, who were to decide whether church officers arraigned before this court had erred so gravely that they deserved to be dismissed.² Such a court was against all canon law, and its decrees of deposition could only give occasion to the most serious collisions. The old Investiture strife of the Middle Ages would be revived in a new form. But Dr Falk lived under the strange illusion that Roman Catholic priests would prefer dependence upon a Prussian President or a Royal High Court to dependence upon their bishops. It was not long before he had to confess in the diet that the power of the Catholic clergy was so great, that the majority would not place reliance in what was said by the government of the State.

But the State had entered upon a slippery path, and it slipped further. A third May-law³ ordained that all Roman Catholic as well as Evangelical clergymen must pass through a German State Gymnasium, study three years at a German State University, and finally undergo a scientific State Examination, the so-called *Kultur-Examen*; the Ministry of Public Worship, however, might in some cases take residence at an ecclesiastical seminary as an equivalent for the study at an university, inasmuch as all ecclesiastical seminaries were hereafter to be under the control of the State. Furthermore, the ecclesiastical authorities were, according to the same law, which dealt also with the appointment of priests, to announce every appointment or transfer to the governor of the province, who had a right to make objections in the course of thirty days. Every neglect on the part of the bishop, with regard to such notifications, was to be punished with a fine of 1,000 thalers, neglect on the part of the priests with a fine of 100 thalers. This law was in the eyes of clergy and of lay people alike an impious law, and it was not acted on. The bishops would not submit to the yoke of the State, and the priest who was properly instituted, according to canon law, considered himself the rightful priest in spite of presidents and May-laws. But the State seized the opportunity of

¹ Höinghaus, 71f.

² *Ibid.*, 99f.

³ *Ibid.*, 133f.

carrying out a series of executions upon the bishops, and several priests were carried off from their altars by the police, amid the protests of the congregations.

Before the May-laws were finally passed, the German bishops sent a letter to all the Catholics in Germany, in which they exhorted them never to forget that only a bishop who has his mission from the Pope is a proper bishop, and only a priest whom the bishop has found worthy and fit is a proper priest. At the same time they begged the Emperor not to sanction laws which faithful Catholics could not observe, and the carrying out of which would lead to "unspeakable misfortune" for the nation and the fatherland.¹ All appeals to halt on the fatal road were rejected by Von Roon, the president of the Council, with the words: "We cannot exist without these laws!" And the State accordingly got all of them carried through—to its own misfortune.

When the May-laws had been passed, Pius IX. wrote the Emperor William a letter (on 7th August 1873) which was in fact an attempt to separate him from his counsellors. The Pope said "that these harsh measures against the Church were entirely superfluous, and that they would be ruinous to the Roman Church." He was also convinced that if a further advance were made along the path now entered upon, the Emperor's own throne would in the end be undermined.² The Emperor William answered: "It is my object to defend internal peace and to uphold respect for the laws." He likewise set aside the Pope's assertion that everybody who has received baptism belongs to the Pope. "The evangelical faith," he wrote, "which I, like my forefathers and the majority of my subjects, profess, does not permit us in our relation to God to acknowledge any other mediator than our Lord Jesus Christ."

The sword of the law had been drawn, and in the period which followed it was used mercilessly; but the May-laws did not humble the bishops. First of all, Ledochowski, Archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, had to go to prison; then Konrad Martin of Paderborn. But the executive did not weary because of meeting with such great opposition, and the year 1874 produced new combative laws. Compulsory

¹ Hahn, 113f.

² *Ibid.*, 130f.

civil marriage was introduced first in Prussia (2nd March 1874), afterwards (6th July 1875) throughout the empire. A sort of serfdom was laid upon all refractory priests, and the government obtained permission to exile all such; measures were taken which made it impossible for an ecclesiastical administrator to enter upon the government of a vacant diocese, until he had taken the oath of allegiance to the State, and the Minister of Public Worship was empowered to appoint a civil administrator of the revenues of the sees, if no ecclesiastic would take the required oath, and in order to get rid of the responsibility for parishes without priests, the government got a law passed, which introduced the election of priests by the parishioners, in case the bishops would not fall in. These new May-laws were no more calculated to heal wounds than Windthorst's speeches; they only caused the flames of civil strife to burst forth more fiercely. And Kulmann's attempt at Kissingen (on 12th July 1874), which caused indignation and alarm in all directions, was at once laid to the charge of the Ultramontanes. It was, in the opinion of the Liberal journals, a testimony how easily Ultramontanism "could tempt the undisciplined masses to rebellion against the authority of the State, and wild natures to criminal activity." Bismarck exclaimed to Windthorst: "You may repudiate this murderer as much as you please; he sticks fast to your coat tails."

In order to revenge itself on the Church, the State first withdrew the German embassy to the see of St Peter. Liberal members of Parliament quoted with great satisfaction all Bismarck's former utterances as to the uselessness of this diplomatic post, and Bismarck himself now declared in Parliament, on 5th December 1874, that it was as absurd for Germany to have an ambassador to the Pope, as for the Emperor of Russia to have an embassy to the Armenian patriarch.¹ This comparison hurt the Vatican deeply, and Pius IX. determined to hurl a new encyclical against Prussia and the German Empire. The encyclical *Quod nunquam* of 5th February 1875 said that the May-laws, old and new, completely overthrew the constitution of the Church, and undermined the sacred authority of the bishops, and the Pope deemed the two im-

¹ Hahn, 159f.

prisoned prelates fortunate because they had been made martyrs in a sacred cause.¹

A fortnight after the issue of this encyclical, the official *Provinzial-Correspondent* wrote: "The Pope dares outright to call those laws invalid, which, in accordance with the constitution, are made by agreement between the Prussian crown and the representatives of the country. This fact removes all doubt that the relation of the Papacy to the temporal governments has, by the recent development, undergone a fundamental change." "Prussia must now show," continues the official organ, "who is sovereign in the country."² In order to effect this object the Roman Church was declared to be in a state of siege. The "provision basket law" of 22nd April 1875 deprived it of all pecuniary help from the State, since it was not proper for the State to give its "enemy" the means of continuing the war. The law of 31st May 1875 excluded from the Prussian kingdom all orders and congregations, except those which nursed the sick. As regards most of the orders, the law was immediately put into force, but for those which were engaged in teaching only after a time, for they could not at once be dispensed with. Finally, as the keystone of the whole legislative work came a law of 18th June 1875, which repealed the three paragraphs of the constitution, which were the palladium of the Roman Church in Prussia.

The battle raged violently during the years 1876 and 1877. The State had now laws enough, and it used them diligently, but without gaining its object. On the contrary, the Prussian statesmen discovered that the division, which was on the point of taking place in Germany after the Vatican Council, was perfectly healed by their "Diocletian-like" persecution. And as has often happened before in the history of the Church injustice and persecution caused in many places a religious awakening. *Le réveil d'un peuple* is the title of a book by a French priest, which gives a sketch of these times which were so straitened for the Roman Church.³ The new German Empire, which had cost so much blood and iron, displayed a gaping wound which the deceitful glory of the *milliards* could not hide. As early as 1874, Bishop Ketteler forbade his priests to

¹ Partly in Hahn, 163f.

² Hahn, 165f.

³ Cp. A. Kannengieser's book with this title (Paris 1892).

take part in the Sedan festival, because it was celebrated "as the victory of an Antichristian party over the Roman Church." Besides, how could there be any festive joy in the years which had brought six German bishops one after another to prison—Gnesen - Posen, Paderborn, Breslau, Cologne, Limburg and Münster—while a number of German priests and members of religious orders were roaming homeless in foreign lands. And what had Germany not suffered morally and socially? The Papacy in the Middle Ages had often found, by melancholy experience, that a long continuing interdict greatly fostered impiety and moral disorder in the country which had been struck by the lightning of Rome. It was now the government, the Emperor and his Chancellor, who felt how the enemies, not only of the Church, but of all the old order of society, were making great conquests and propagating their doctrines, whilst State and Church were at strife. Where the voice of justice and charity was silenced, nothing was heard of "but hatred, murder, and savage camps," and men acquainted with the facts calculated that the *Kulturkampf* had cost Prussia more than 450,000,000 Reichmarks (£225,000) a year.

But for the moment there was no prospect of peace. The aged Pope, who with his advancing years grew more and more talkative, made use of every occasion to attack "the new Nero" and "the modern Attila." The times had become so evil that he felt it to be a misfortune that he had lived to see "the years of Peter." For what happened in Germany was only a part of the sorrows that were crowding upon him.

The new government at Rome was in many ways strengthened, and it used its power without paying a too scrupulous regard to justice and fairness. A change of ministry at Rome in July 1873, which brought Minghetti into Lanza's place, caused no change in the relations between the Vatican and the Quirinal. The passing of the law which dealt with the monasteries and the church property had made the breach between the papal Curia and the Italian government so wide, that only the arrows of hatred could fly over it.

And the carrying out of the new law was a daily source of vexation to the Vatican party. The Italian Ministry of Public Worship took up its abode in the Dominican convent at Maria sopra Minerva; the *Collegium Romanum*, the centre of Roman

Catholic science, in spite of protest from the rectors of the ten most important national colleges at Rome, was confiscated in order to be subjected to a "reconstruction suited to the times," and Father Beckx was obliged to take his archives for security to the Vatican. Somewhat later, the excellent library of the *Collegium Romanum*, augmented by robbery from different monastic libraries, was transformed into a Victor Emmanuel library, and the famous convent of Francis of Assisi was converted into a boarding school for the sons of schoolmasters. The pain caused by these acts of violence was further aggravated when the Pope heard what a festal reception had been prepared, not only by the new Nero on the Spree, but also by the Emperor Francis Joseph, for the Piedmontese robber.

Shortly after his return from Vienna and Berlin, Victor Emmanuel went to Turin to be present at the unveiling of the monument which grateful Italy had erected to Cavour; and, on 15th November 1873, he opened the Italian Parliament with a speech from the throne which caused fresh offence and alarm at the Vatican. To Roman Catholic ears it sounded like the most bitter irony when he said: "That Italy had shown that Rome could be the metropolis of the kingdom without the Papacy losing anything of its independence," and there was a breath from the country of the May-laws in his statement that he would not allow "attacks to be made upon the laws and institutions of the nation under the cloak of sacred rights."¹ In the encyclical *Etsi multa luctuosa* of 21st November 1873, which is one of the great lamentations of the oppressed Papacy, the Pope once more gave utterance to his sorrow and his indignation. In it he complained of the doing away with the Roman monasteries, of the *Kulturkampf* in Switzerland, where the Bishops Mermillod and Lachat and the papal nuncio had been expelled, and of the May-laws in Prussia; and he flung his excommunication at Professor Reinkens, who, with the approval of the Prussian government, had become the Bishop of the Old Catholics, and against all who joined the new schism in Germany.²

Not long after, birds of storm made their appearance in France also. For the moment MacMahon's presidency

¹ Massari, 559f.

² Schulte; *Altkatholicismus*, 405. Stepischnegg I, 24f.

awakened glad hopes in all the adherents of the Papacy. It was a comfort to Pius IX. to hear that band after band of pilgrims was going to Paray le Monial in the diocese of Autun, in order to pray to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, in the place where Marie Alacoque had lived,¹ to restore the temporal power of the Pope, and to regenerate France. On 29th July 1873 a document was even read at the altar at Paray le Monial, by which France solemnly consecrated herself to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus; and, shortly before, the National Assembly had by a large majority given its consent to the erection of a church of the *Sacré Cœur* on Montmartre.² On 5th August the Count of Paris made his important pilgrimage to Frohsdorf, near Vienna, to surrender the claims of the Orléans family upon the French throne to the grandson of Charles X., and many French Catholics hoped that the Marshal President would become another Monk. But the conflict over the white standard quickly destroyed all these monarchical dreams. The French bishops, however, felt so secure under MacMahon's presidentship and the De Broglie Cabinet that in their pastoral epistles they dared to pronounce strong condemnations upon the German *Kulturkampf*. But these episcopal wailings gave occasion for a German intervention which was very painful to French national sentiment, and, on 26th December 1873 the French Minister of Public Worship was obliged to send to the episcopal hotspurs, amongst others to Bishop Freppel of Angers, a mild exhortation not to create difficulties for the government by a too open pronouncement of their otherwise legitimate feelings.³ This did not satisfy Bismarck, and the German papers declared that every one who cast in his lot with the Vatican was the sworn enemy of Germany. On 19th January 1874, the French government was compelled to take another step which hurt the feelings of the nation. The publication of the *Univers* was forbidden for two months, "because the articles in that journal, and the documents which it published [the pastoral letters of the bishops], were of such a nature that they might cause diplo-

¹ See above, I, 74; II, 258.

² Stepischnegg I, 24f. Paguelle de Follenay: *Vie du Cardinal Guibert* II, 589f.

³ Stepischnegg I, 467; Cornut: *Mgr. Freppel*, 252f.

matic difficulties.”¹ It was especially an episcopal pastoral occasioned by the encyclical *Etsi multa luctuosa*, which had called forth the last interposition of Bismarck.

On the day after the decree against the *Univers*, the French Foreign Minister, the Duc Decazes, declared in the National Assembly that France, in spite of all dutiful reverence for the Holy Father and of all her interest in his independence, would continue, as circumstances had developed, without *arrière-pensée*, to be on friendly terms with Italy. This declaration was by no means superfluous. Victor Emmanuel had been painfully affected when the French government, at the end of 1873, had recalled Fournier, who was a friend of Italy, from the embassy at Rome, and at the farewell audience the King did not conceal how strained his relations to the existing French government were.² The French warship *Orénoque*, which still lay off Cività Vecchia to be at the service of the Pope, was a menace in the eyes of the Italians. It was not recalled until October 1874, after the French government had obtained Pius IX.’s approval of the step,³ and another warship was then stationed at Ajaccio, to be near at hand, in case the Pope should wish to leave Rome.

Pius IX. did not think of such a thing; but just as little did he think of approaching the Quirinal. The Vatican was much displeased with a picture which was exhibited in 1873 in all the shop windows at Rome; it represented Pius IX. and Victor Emmanuel arm-in-arm as old friends.⁴ The continuous crowds before this picture, and the remarks which fell from the assemblage, showed that the wish for a reconciliation between the contending parties was a real one with many Romans, not the least with the lower classes. But this wish found no response from those in command. There were not a few Italian politicians who thought that the moment had at last come for following in the steps of Prussia, and incitements from abroad were not wanting. Thus, on 9th January 1874, the *Kölnische Zeitung* published a German translation of a pretended Bull (*Apostolicæ sedis munus*), of 28th May 1873, in which Pius IX. was supposed to have decided that the election of his successor should be carried out with the utmost

¹ Stepischneegg I, 468.

² Massari, 561f.

³ Cappelletti II, 350.

⁴ Bonghi in the *Revue des deux mondes*, 116.

despatch, *præsente cadavere*.¹ Afterwards, the Rhenish paper even published the Latin text of the Bull, which, the introduction stated, was especially intended to prevent the election of a pope whom the enemies of the Church might make use of to carry out their godless plans. Any well-informed man could easily discern that the Bull was a wretched piece of patchwork. It contained some fragments of the Bull of Pius VI.: *Quum nos superiore anno*, but the rest was a somewhat clumsy forgery. Antonelli at once sent an official statement to the papal nuncios abroad that the pretended Bull was apocryphal; and Bonghi, in an article in the *Perseveranza* for 22nd January, sharply taunted the German critics because they had allowed themselves to be fooled. The false Bull was, according to Bonghi, an electioneering manœuvre which, in view of the coming election to the German Parliament, was intended to bring confusion into the organisation of the Roman Catholic electors, and at the same time to provoke Italy. But there was a grain of truth in this story after all. As far back as 23rd August 1871, Pius IX. had secretly got ready a Bull, *In hac sublimi*, which made detailed regulations for the coming papal election,² and after this there followed, on 8th September 1874, another (*Licet per apostolicas*), and finally, on 10th October 1877, a third (*Consultura*).³ These three Bulls were to remove such regulations regarding the Conclave as might postpone the election of a new pope, and also to prevent the secular powers, and especially Italy, from interfering in the coming Conclave.

On 23rd March 1874 it was twenty-five years since Victor Emmanuel, on the battlefield of Novara, had received the Sardinian crown. On that day there was high festival at the Quirinal,⁴ but in the numerous speeches addressed by Victor Emmanuel to the many deputations which came to greet him, he avoided with great tact anything that might wound the Vatican. Only in his answer to the Senate he said in passing that it had been the effort of his government "to unite the maintenance of the rights of the State with obedience to the religion of their fathers, progress with

¹ Lucius Lector: *Le conclave*, 717f.

² Lucius Lector, 721. The Bull is printed on p. 749f.

³ Both these are also printed in Lucius Lector, 757f. and 762f.

⁴ Massari, 564f. Cappelletti III, 346f.

tradition." That section of the Roman nobility which had remained loyal to the Vatican made a counter-demonstration to the festivity at the Quirinal by driving in a long line of carriages to the Pope and assuring him of their unbroken fidelity. Don Mario Chigi was the spokesman of the noble deputation.

Pius IX. received a still greater ovation when 17th June arrived, and with it the twenty-seventh anniversary of his elevation to the chair of St Peter. But those who came to the Vatican that day could be in no doubt that peace with Italy was a long way off. Pius IX., in the presence of the cardinals, repeated his usual protest against the Sardinian usurpation, against the abolition of the religious orders, and against the sacrilegious acts which "the enemies of the Church of Jesus Christ" had committed. He stated that he had been appealed to from various quarters to "approach the new-comers." But that could never be. "It is impossible to find a *modus vivendi* with an antagonist who meditates incessantly upon a *modus nocendi, auferendi, destruendi, occidendi*."¹ In those days the enthusiasm for Pius IX. often expressed itself in the cry: *Evviva il Papa Re!* But it made others shout: *Morte al Papa! Abbasso la religione!*

Dupanloup was in Rome in Lent, 1874, for the first time since the Council.² Pius IX. received him kindly, but it does not seem to have been quite easy for the old Pope to throw the veil of forgetfulness over all the trouble which the Bishop of Orléans had at one time given him. During his stay in Rome, Dupanloup was especially working for the realisation of his favourite project of the canonisation of Jeanne d'Arc. In the Maid of Orléans his own episcopal city would obtain a local saint, and her inclusion in the list of saints would be a protest against the homage which French Radicalism at that time paid to the poet of *La Pucelle*. Dupanloup knew very well that the Marshal President and his ministers wished to see the red hat on his head,³ but more water had to run into the sea before the Vatican could give such a distinction to a man who had acted as Dupanloup had acted at the Council. As soon as the Bishop of Orléans got home, he wrote an open letter to

¹ Stepischnegg I, 26.

² Lagrange III, 288.

³ *Ibid.*, 287.

Minghetti on the way in which Italy was robbing the Papacy. This brought him congratulations from all sides. Pius IX. said that Dupanloup's defence of the temporal power of St Peter's see was "irrefutable," but he did not send the cardinal's hat to the French *Doctor irrefutabilis*.

Minghetti set one of the pens that were at his disposal to answer the bishop's letter, which was stronger in rhetoric than in strict cogency of proof. But nothing further came, either of this letter, or of another, which the author sent in 1876 to the same Italian statesman, with regard to the law applying the conscription to priests.

A strife between different forms of Christianity, which broke out in England in the autumn of 1874, was of far greater importance. In the October number of the *Contemporary Review* Gladstone raised the question, how far there was any likelihood of some of the Anglican priesthood being "engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanise" the Anglican Church. He dismissed all ideas of such a project. He wrote:

"At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth: when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."¹

This rather trenchant statement was an answer to certain accusations of Crypto-Catholicism, which had been directed against the great statesman,² especially after the Marquis of Ripon had gone over to the Roman Church. Gladstone's words, as may be imagined, made a great stir in the Roman camp, and not a few English Catholics took up arms against them. In order to defend his assertions, Gladstone, in the early days of November 1874, published a pamphlet entitled: *The*

¹ [The words are quoted at the beginning of *The Vatican Decrees*, p. xviii.]

² Cp. Purcell II, 471f. and the *Nineteenth Century* for July 1898.

*Vatican decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance: a political expostulation.*¹ In this he said that the Roman Church always comes into conflict with the State more easily than any other Christian body, because it is guilty of many encroachments upon the sphere of civil life. Manning at one time had even praised the Roman Church for its combativeness, which caused it to oppose when all other communities obeyed and held their peace. This combativeness, according to Gladstone, had increased since the Vatican Council. In old days Rome always boasted of its immutability in doctrine, as opposed to the "variations" which Bossuet laid to the charge of Protestantism, but now it pointed to a living authority—the Pope. Thus it came into conflict with the history of the past. Its incompatibility with modern thought appeared in its violent policy. The old synods, and even the Council of Trent, always paid regard to the needs of the times; but the modern dogmas of Mary's Immaculate Conception and of Papal Infallibility were defiantly forced through. In the condemnations of the Syllabus Rome had lately brought out again the "rusty tools" of the Middle Ages, and the Vatican decrees constituted a threat to civil allegiance.

Manning at once sent to the *Times* a preliminary reply which was intended to prove that Gladstone's anxiety about the Vatican decrees was entirely groundless.² His letter to the *Times*, together with a short explanation to the editor of the *New York Herald*, was telegraphed to the latter paper, so that the Americans received the Roman Catholic Archbishop's defence before they could read Gladstone's attack. Manning accused Gladstone of being influenced by Döllinger's clearly erroneous view of the meaning of the Vatican decrees, both in political and civil matters, and from another quarter Gladstone was described as a thorough "Döllingerite." The Roman Catholic bishops, Ullathorne, Clifford, and Vaughan, put forth their opinions in various ways; Manning afterwards wrote a detailed refutation, and even Mgr. Francesco Nardi at Rome entered the lists with a polemical work. The multitude of answers showed that Gladstone had touched a tender spot;

¹ Reprinted in Gladstone's *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion* (London 1875). See also Nielsen's paper in the *Dansk Kirketidende* for 1875.

² Purcell II, 473f.

and a view of the Vatican decrees, like that which Gladstone had expounded, was bound to be particularly disagreeable to the Roman Church on English and American soil. Many expected to hear again the old cry of "No Popery."

But the greatest interest was excited amongst those who were behind the scenes by Newman's *Letter to his Grace the Duke of Norfolk*. This letter made it plain that there were very serious differences of opinion amongst the English Catholics with regard to "Vaticanism." Newman expressed himself in the letter to the Duke of Norfolk with such great caution, that the *Dublin Review* and other organs of extreme Ultramontaniam called the pious Oratorian a "minimiser," and accused him of writing in a spirit of opposition to the Pope.¹ Some people in England even feared that Pius IX. would condemn Newman's letter; but the Rector of the English College at Rome, Father O'Callaghan, set Manning's mind at rest, by declaring that the Vatican did not contemplate such a step. It was only desired that Father Newman should receive a friendly reminder that there were certain "objectionable passages" in his letter.²

Gladstone gave his assailants a double answer. In the *Quarterly Review* for January 1875 he reviewed the official edition of the speeches of Pius IX.,³ and in a fresh pamphlet called *Vaticanism* he defended his view of the Vatican decrees. The conflict then died away, and, as usual, both sides claimed the victory. But Gladstone's writings had made a great impression upon many, and the former apathy towards "Vaticanism" had received a shock. Unfortunately, the old friendship between Gladstone and Manning seems to have suffered seriously, and after this literary battle the Archbishop of Westminster drew nearer to Disraeli and the Tories.⁴ But Gladstone's polemics had called the attention of the Italian government to the passionate speeches of Pius IX., and at the beginning of 1875 the Minister of Justice, Vigliani, warned the Lenten preachers at Rome, and the Vatican Press, against using too strong language, and against copying the violent expressions of Pius IX.

This warning was not superfluous; for the Vatican was continually on the warpath. At the usual consistory before

¹ Purcell II, 480.

² *Ibid.*, 486.

³ See above, p. 430.

⁴ Purcell II, 523f.

Christmas 1874, Pius IX. had made an allocution, in which he repeated the old complaints and accused his opponents of wishing to introduce a new heathenism.¹ On Christmas Eve he issued an encyclical which promised that 1875 should bring the Year of Jubilee, which 1850, on account of sad political circumstances, had failed to bring. And at the New Year fresh challenges proceeded from the Vatican and its adherents, in different directions. In March Pius IX. appointed Ledochowski and Manning—but not Dupanloup—cardinals, and the allocution which he made on that occasion ended in an attack upon the schools which the Italian government had established at Rome, and upon an Italian bill for subjecting priests to military conscription, which had given great offence in ecclesiastical circles. In April there came a decree from the Congregation of Rites, which announced that the whole Roman Church was consecrated to the most sacred Heart of Jesus, and on 16th June the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris laid the foundation-stone of the church of the *Sacré Cœur* on Montmartre. But this solemnity had to be performed more quietly than had been intended, on account of the growing Radicalism in France.²

Affairs in France altogether compelled the Roman Catholic leaders there to proceed with great caution. The ecclesiastical party had certainly won a considerable victory through the statute for the emancipation of secondary education (12th July 1875), which made it possible by October 1876 to open five Roman Catholic universities, at Lille, Paris, Angers, Lyons, and Poitiers, and afterwards also at Toulouse.³ But everything pointed to a near settlement of accounts between the sons of the Church and of the Revolution. *Où allons nous?* was the title of a new pamphlet which the indefatigable Bishop of Orléans published in 1876.⁴ In this he complains of the notorious French levity, which can so easily forget, but can only learn with such difficulty; and he predicts for his country a great flood, which will bring both religious and social misfortunes upon France.

¹ "Impietas . . . eo tendit, ut, catholica religione, si id posset, eversa, vota expert regni sui constituendi, regni scilicet ethnicae corruptionis." Stepischnegg I, 27.

² Paguelle de Follenay, 609f.

³ Stepischnegg I, 47f.

⁴ Lagrange III, 334f.

In Italy, also, Radicalism was gaining more and more ground. In March 1876 the Minghetti Cabinet was succeeded by that of Depretis; and in the new government, taken from the Left, there were such pronounced enemies of the Church as Nicotera, Mancini, and Zanardelli. Nicotera, who was Minister of the Interior, immediately forbade all ecclesiastical processions outside the church buildings, and a Catholic congress in Bologna was stopped in October 1876, because it gave occasion to serious tumults on the part of the Radical mob. Mancini, as Minister of Justice, prepared a bill, which was intended to paralyse clerical influence on family life, and in the Chamber of Deputies the tone towards the Church and the person of the Pope became more and more provocative. As five years had elapsed without the Pope making any sign of drawing the pension which the law of guarantee had assigned to him, the sum so saved was declared to have reverted to the Italian exchequer, and on that occasion language was used with regard to the Church and Christianity, which called to mind the worst times of the French Revolution.

And just at this difficult moment, Pius IX. lost his old, tried counsellor. On 6th November 1876 Cardinal Antonelli died after a long and painful illness. He had scarcely closed his eyes, before his daughter, the Countess Lambertini, began a lawsuit concerning his large fortune, and this suit, which was rich in scandalous revelations, did not increase respect for the Curia. Antonelli's death did not affect the old Pope as much as had been expected. "Do not speak any more to me about him," Pius IX. is reported to have said when he received the tidings that the Cardinal had breathed his last. "The red Pope" had sometimes been as burdensome to the "white Pope" as was the "black Pope" (the Jesuit General Beckx). Antonelli's corpse was taken out late at night to the Campo Verano, and the Romans noticed that a hearse of the second class was thought sufficiently good for him. They considered that the dead Secretary of State was buried as if he had been a great sinner.¹

It was difficult to find a successor to Antonelli, for the Vatican had no superfluity of material for statesmen. Where

¹ Silvagni: *La corte e la società Romana* III, 729f. Cp. S. Münz: *Aus Quirinal und Vatican* (Berlin 1891), 115.

non possumus is the highest wisdom, political talents are not much developed. Cardinal Manning, who came to Rome at the time when Antonelli died, could not refrain from exclaiming when he saw the Pope's surroundings, "Alas, how changed!" He found everything "at sixes and sevens."¹ Only a few cardinals thought of active measures; most of them held that nothing should be done, and some *miracolisti* sat still and waited for a miracle of some kind to take place for the salvation of the Papacy. Everywhere, of course, the candidates for the vacant post of State Secretary were discussed, and Manning had an opportunity of talking over the few possibilities with Pius IX. himself. He did not conceal from the Pope that there was a sad stagnation in the Sacred College, and he found that the high prelates, as a rule, were remarkably deficient in a clear understanding of affairs, in foresight, and in readiness of resource. But Manning also discovered with sorrow that Pius IX. had become weak and garrulous, and that he could not keep secrets. "My soul is sorrowful even unto death," he wrote on 8th December 1876 in his diary on his return from Rome.

Then the great problem was solved. Pius IX. had chosen Giovanni Simeoni as Antonelli's successor. The new secretary was born in the diocese of Palestrina on 12th July 1816, and Pius IX. had given him the red hat in 1875. Nobody expected that Simeoni would be an *Antonelli il secondo*. Pius IX. is reported to have said himself, "I have had a statesman by my side, and it was not for my happiness. Simeoni can at least help me by praying."² Soon after Antonelli, another of Pius IX.'s most intimate circle died — the Vicar-general, Patrizi, who was specially trusted by the old Pope. He was succeeded by Raffaele Monaco la Valletta, born at Aquila, 23rd February 1827, and therefore a comparatively young man.

It was at a difficult moment that one of the Vatican's *miracolisti* succeeded the shrewd Antonelli. In the speech from the throne on 20th November 1876, Victor Emmanuel had used threats which seemed to reveal that the new government of the Left was willing to follow in the steps of Prussia. "The liberties," so ran the speech, "which under

¹ Purcell II, 572f.

² Münz, 115.

my government are accorded to the Church in richer measure than in any other Catholic state, must not be used in such a way that public liberty is infringed or the national sovereignty diminished. My ministry will make the necessary proposals for your consideration as to employing those restrictions and conditions, which are indicated in the law concerning the liberties of the Church." The allusion in this speech was to Mancini's bill, before-mentioned, concerning the wrong use made by the clergy of their power. It was brought into the Chamber of Deputies on 7th January, and was passed on 24th January by 150 votes against 100. The committee of the Senate which was to examine the bill, proposed to the Senators on 5th March to postpone the consideration of this matter until the new penal code had been passed, but the proposal was not carried, and Mancini's bill was therefore immediately brought under discussion in the Senate.

It was no wonder that Mancini's proposal awoke consternation in the Vatican; it was in reality an Italian May-law of the most pronounced type. On 12th March 1877, when Pius IX., for the first time after the fall of Rome, gave the red hat to some new cardinals, he delivered an allocution which was both incisive and aggressive. "When this bill," he said, "is passed, the secular tribunal will be able to decide how far a priest, in the administration of the sacraments and the preaching of the Word, has offended the public conscience and domestic peace." He then pointed out, in connexion with some unguarded utterances of Mancini, to the effect that sometimes, when the chief instigator of a crime cannot be got hold of, the accomplices must be punished, that the new bill was really directed against himself. It was therefore a fresh testimony that he was not, and could not be, in possession of full liberty, as long as he was under a foreign sway in his own city. "The liberty, security, and peace of the Church," he concluded, "will never be realised so long as the exercise of the highest apostolic office is subject to the strife of parties, to the arbitrariness of rulers, to the changes of political elections, and to crafty people who prefer expediency to justice."¹

As this allocution was given to all ambassadors at the Vatican, the ministry thought it best to reply to it. On 17th

¹ Stepischnegg I, 32f.

March, Mancini sent a circular letter to the Procurators-General, in which he complained in strong terms that Pius IX. was ungrateful towards Italy. The journals, which had published the Pope's address, ought really to be confiscated, but the government did not in this case wish to put in force the severity of the law. "The Ministry," he said, "is strong in its belief in the unity and liberty of the country, and it will give the world a clear proof of its long-suffering, patience, and strength, and show how great a measure of liberty is granted to the Pope."¹ These words provoked the Vatican still more, and on 21st March Simeoni wrote a circular letter to the papal nuncios, which critically examined Mancini's beautiful phrases, and complained of the latest action of the Italian government. Many conservative Italian politicians were unwilling to give their country a May-law, and on 7th May Mancini's bill was rejected in the Senate, 105 senators voting against it, and only 92 for it. But the smallness of the majority gave the Vatican a serious *memento*.

The new phase in the duel between the Quirinal and the Vatican nowhere attracted greater attention than in France, where everything pointed to the victory of Radicalism. After the papal allocution of 12th March, several petitions were sent to the President and the Legislature, begging them once and for all to defend the independence of the Pope, and the French bishops issued new pastoral letters, which depicted the sad situation of Pius IX. Bishop de Ladoue of Nevers wrote a letter to MacMahon, in which he advised him to avoid every form of solidarity with Italy, and "to keep the France of Charlemagne and St Louis free from any association with the Italian revolution." In consequence of this letter De Ladoue received a polite warning not to cause difficulties in the relations between France and Italy by mixing up politics with the work of the Church; and Jules Simon, who was then President of the Cabinet and Minister of the Interior, ordered the prefects to take care that signatures were not collected to a protest against Mancini's bill. But the clerical party would not cease their agitation. It was safe, because it had the Marshal President on its side, and because there was a Conservative majority in the Senate, as against the large Republican majority of 363 in the first Chamber. But, at last, the Roman Catholic agitation

¹ Stepschnegg I, 437.

became so violent that Jules Simon, "the least anti-clerical of Liberals,"¹ had to respond to a summons from the Chamber to make use of the same disciplinary measures towards the Church as Napoleon III. and Louis Philippe had used; and Gambetta flung out his winged word: "*Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi!*"

Some days after, on 16th May, the official paper contained a letter from the President to Jules Simon, in which MacMahon declared that the Prime Minister no longer enjoyed his confidence, and that it was evident that he had also lost that influence in the Chamber, which a Prime Minister ought to have.² After the receipt of MacMahon's letter, Jules Simon resigned, and De Broglie became his successor, but only to give place again after an unsuccessful dissolution of the Chamber, to a Republican Cabinet under Dufaure. After 16th May, the antagonism between *les deux Frances* had become still more sharp, and the political crisis at last assumed such a form, that MacMahon, to the great sorrow of the clerical party, considered it best to retire (in January 1879). Then, as Gambetta expressed it at a school festival in June 1877, "the sons of 1789" had risen in force "against the agents of the Roman theocracy," and the sons of the French Revolution, to the horror of the Vatican, stretched out a fraternal hand to the Italian Revolution. On 4th January 1878, Gambetta was received in audience at the Quirinal, and he left Victor Emmanuel "enchanted with the prudence and amiability of the Italian king."³

But the anti-revolution also collected its forces. On 3rd June 1877, Pius IX. celebrated his golden episcopal jubilee, and, by a symbolism easily understood, the church of S. Pietro in Vincoli, Simeoni's titular church, was made the centre of all the ecclesiastical solemnities occasioned by the papal jubilee. Crowds of pilgrims came to Rome from all countries with gold and incense, and in his speeches to them Pius IX. as usual unburdened his anxious heart. On the same day, Victor Emmanuel celebrated, at the Quirinal, the thirtieth anniversary of the Italian (that is to say, the Piedmontese) Constitution. The papal party asserted, probably with some exaggeration, that 3,000 carriages on that day drove to the Vatican, and only 150 to the Quirinal.⁴ These

¹ J. E. C. Bodley: *France* (London 1898) I, 272.

² About the importance of this step, see Bodley, 273f.

³ Cappelletti III, 403.

⁴ Stepischnegg I, 33.

numbers were in any case no trustworthy expression of the real strength of the contending parties. But it pleased Pius IX. to see the long train of carriages driving across the piazza of St Peter's. A month after the jubilee, on 19th July, he fulfilled a cherished desire of many pilgrims by appointing St Francis of Sales a *Doctor ecclesiæ*.

When Victor Emmanuel gave Gambetta the interview which has been mentioned, he was already a doomed man. On the following day, he received the news of General La Marmora's death, and it affected him much, and on the next day his illness increased. As soon as it was reported at the Vatican that Victor Emmanuel was on his death-bed, Pius IX. sent his *sacrista*, Mgr. Marinelli, the priest of the apostolic palaces, to carry to the dying sovereign in the Quirinal an important message from the Vatican.¹ Marinelli put himself in communication with Anzino, the domestic chaplain of Victor Emmanuel, and he referred him to the secretary of the Cabinet, Count Natale Aghemo. Count Aghemo immediately—it was on the evening of 8th January—informed the sick King that the Pope had sent his *sacrista* with an important message, and Marinelli would undoubtedly have been received the next day if the King's illness had not become worse. But on the morning of 9th January his condition was so serious, that the royal physician, Dr Bruno, thought it his duty to ask the dying King, if he did not wish to receive the sacraments. Victor Emmanuel at once said that it was his desire, and Mgr. Anzino was then summoned to hear his confession. Anzino then applied to the parish priest of S. Vincenzo a Trevi in order to obtain what was needful for administering the last sacraments to the King. The priest affirmed that he did not dare to fulfil Anzino's request, and the latter then exclaimed: "Remember that the King is about to die! and consider the great responsibility you undertake before God and men." At last the two clergymen agreed to go to the acting Vicar of Rome, Mgr. Giulio Lenti, who, after considering for some time, gave Mgr. Anzino permission to administer the *viaticum* to the King.

Victor Emmanuel received the Eucharist in the presence of a great many people, who filled the sickroom, but when that

¹ Cappelletti III, 405. Cappelletti bases his story on the account of those who were present.

sacrament had been administered, everybody left the death-bed in order that Mgr. Anzino might give him Extreme Unction. Dr Bruno advised that this sacrament should be postponed until the *Ave Mariâ*, because the King was so tired. But when the evening bell rang, Victor Emmanuel was no more amongst the living. It was Crispi whose duty it was, as Minister of the Interior, to announce to all Italian prefects and sub-prefects, that Victor Emmanuel had died at half-past seven o'clock in the evening "after receiving the consolations of religion." These consolations, as the party of the Vatican asserted, had been administered to him "as a repentant Catholic," not as the King of Italy.¹ When the news of his death was brought to Pius IX., the Pope is said to have lifted his eyes to heaven, and, after a short prayer, to have said: "He died like a Christian, a King, and a *galantuomo*."²

Victor Emmanuel's funeral was, as Massari says, "an apotheosis." Thousands from all parts of the country congregated at Rome to follow the first King of Italy to his grave. Victor Emmanuel was not, like his forefathers, laid to rest at the Superga, but amidst the ringing of the bells of the Capitol and Monte Citorio. His body was brought to the Pantheon, and the ancient temple became thenceforth a place of pilgrimage for all friends of the unity and liberty of Italy. But on the day after the King's funeral Cardinal Simeoni sent to all the diplomatists accredited to the Vatican a renewed protest against the robbery committed by the Piedmontese government, because Victor Emmanuel's eldest son, by calling himself King of Italy, "sanctioned his father's usurpation."³

This protest was the last administrative act of Pius IX. His demise had been expected for many years, and in 1877 there had been rumours on several occasions that he was near death, but he had always recovered. On 29th January 1878, he signed the proposal of the congregation of the Propaganda for the re-establishment of a Catholic hierarchy in Scotland,⁴ a parallel to the settlement of the English hierarchy in 1850,⁵ and his successor on 28th March appointed two archbishops and four bishops for the Roman Catholics in the country of Mary Stuart and of John Knox.

¹ Stepischnegg I, 441.

² Massari, 591. Cappelletti III, 413.

³ Stepischnegg I, 35.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 30.

⁵ See above, p. 183.

At the beginning of February 1878 the weakness of the aged Pope increased. On 6th February, when Cardinal Manning came to the Vatican to present to the Pope some Peter's pence and to get a signature from him, Mgr. Vannutelli said that Pius IX. could not write legibly, and Manning therefore left immediately after receiving the sick Pope's blessing.¹ When he was gone, Simeoni said to Pius IX.: "You will be better to-morrow!" "No—the contrary," the Pope answered; and he was right. By the morning of 7th February the whole of the Vatican was prepared for the death of Pius IX. in the course of the day. The antechamber to his bedroom was full of cardinals, who wished to take leave of the dying Pope—and to discuss together the choice of his successor. At half-past eight o'clock he received the last sacraments in full consciousness, and he had still so much strength that he could himself say the liturgical prayers at the administration. He then lay quietly back, with peace and gentleness upon his noble features. When Cardinal Manning knelt by his bed and kissed his hand, he said *Addio, carissimo!* Once he lifted the crucifix to his lips, but the tired hand let it fall, and at half-past five o'clock in the afternoon he passed peacefully away.

The Camerlengo, Cardinal Gioacchino Pecci, immediately after Pius IX.'s death gave orders that all inquisitive persons who had entered the Vatican should go away, and then the usual service of sorrow began with the recitation of the penitential psalms and the prayers for the dead.² At eight o'clock the Camerlengo according to ancient custom struck thrice with a little silver hammer on the dead man's forehead, crying, "Giovanni! Giovanni! Giovanni!" and when he received no answer, he turned to those present and said: "The Pope is really dead!" Then all knelt down and the Cardinals read the *De profundis*. The Fisherman's Ring was then removed from the dead Pope's finger to be broken by and by; and after a legal certificate of death had been signed, Pecci retired to a room close by, to draw up the official announcements of the grief which had befallen the Catholic Church. On all the church doors of Rome were posted notices of the Pope's death, and the telegraph was set in motion to summon the cardinals as quickly as possible to the Conclave.

¹ Purcell II, 548f.

² Lucius Lector, 147f.

The church bells rang, and after some hesitation the Syndic of Rome, Pianciani, also gave orders to ring the big bell of the Capitol, which for so many centuries had rung in the change of Pope.

While Cardinal Pecci, according to a regulation for the Conclave, which Pius IX. had signed four weeks before his death,¹ was busily engaged in arranging everything for the impending election of a Pope, the dead Pope was embalmed. His internal organs were laid in an urn, which was deposited in the crypt of St Peter's, and on 9th February the embalmed body was carried in full canonicals down to the Chapel of the Sacrament in St Peter's. On 13th February it was laid in a coffin, and when it had been sufficiently sealed, it was hoisted up into the temporary papal grave in a niche above one of the doors in the Choir Chapel of St Peter's, where it was to remain until the final resting-place in the church of S. Lorenzo outside the walls had been put in the necessary condition.

More than three years passed, before the niche behind the altar and the marble sarcophagus, in noble style, with its plain inscription, were ready from the hands of the artists; and not until 13th July 1881 could the body of Pius IX. be removed to S. Lorenzo. But although the removal took place at night, and with the permission of the government, scandalous scenes took place. *Al Tevere! al fiume la carogna!* was the last greeting of the Romans to the Pope whom they had received with such great rejoicings.

But the Jesuit General, who in 1847 had uttered those desponding words about the young Pius IX.: "This Pope is the scourge of the Church (*il flagello della chiesa*); we have nothing to hope for, but the big bell of the Capitol,"² would undoubtedly have spoken otherwise, if he had been alive, when this big bell of the Capitol rang on 7th February 1878.

¹ Quoted in Lucius Lector, 774f.

² Massimo d'Azeglio: *Correspondance politique*, 142.

INDEX

- AACHEN, Peace of, i. 30
 Academy, French, at Rome, i. 177
Accademia di Religione Cattolica, ii. 307
 — *della Concezione Immacolata*, ii. 77
 — *dei Lincei*, ii. 127
 "Acceptants" and "Appellants," i. 16,
 17
 Acton, Neapolitan minister, i. 183, 197
 —, Lord, ii. 309, 321 foll., 420
 Adami, General of the Servites, i. 41 *note*
 Adragna, ii. 298
 Aghemo, Natale, ii. 462
 Agier, Jansenist leader, i. 158
 Aguesseau, d', i. 18
 Aguglia, Salvatore, ii. 229
 Aiguillon, Duc d', i. 73, 83, 84, 139
 Alacoque, Marguerite Marie, i. 74; ii.
 258, 449
 Albani, Gianfrancesco, i. 39, 114
 —, Elena, ii. 111
 —, Giovanni Francesco, i. 184, 191,
 201, 203, 307, 362; ii. 1 foll., 34 foll.
 38 foll., 42 foll., 47, 52 foll., 61, 66
 Albany, Charles Edward, Earl of, i. 193
 Aldobrandini, Prince, ii. 140, 144
 Alembert, d', i. 29, 51
 Alexander I, Emperor of Russia, i. 355,
 364
 — VII., Pope, i. 6, 7, 9
 — VIII., Pope, i. 11, 101
 Alfieri, the poet, i. 189, 349
 Alliance, the Holy, i. 364, 374
 — the Evangelical, ii. 78, 295
 Almada, i. 38, 40
 Aloysius Gonzaga, i. 21, 58
 Alquier, i. 288
 Altieri, Cardinal, ii. 177
 Alzog, ii. 298
 Amat, Cardinal, ii. 94, 117
 Amici, sculptor, ii. 101
 Amiens, Peace of, i. 252, 254
 Amort, Eusebius, i. 102
 Ancarani, Angelo, ii. 77
 Ancona, i. 184, 284, 357; ii. 60 foll., 66
 foll., 73, 80, 221
 Andrea, Cardinal d', ii. 229
 Anfossi, i. 350; ii. 7
 Angelis, de, ii. 317, 326, 341, 350, 355
Annales de la Religion, i. 158, 159
 — *Catholiques*, i. 159
 Anselm, St, i. 92
 Antibes Legion, ii. 275, 391
 Antici, Polish minister, i. 172
 Antonelli, Cardinal, the elder, i. 200,
 203 foll., 210 foll., 311
 —, Cardinal, the younger, ii. 131, 132,
 137 foll., 142, 144 foll., 148 foll., 164,
 166 foll., 170 foll., 174 foll., 180, 187,
 200, 203, 204, 210, 213, 216 foll., 227,
 229 foll., 233 foll., 245, 248 foll., 250
 foll., 253, 264, 266, 272 foll., 296,
 300, 318, 326, 339, 345, 347, 351, 360
 foll., 378 foll., 388 foll., 393 foll., 395
 foll., 397, 400 foll., 404, 405 foll., 412,
 415, 417, 423, 425 foll., 429, 436 foll.,
 439, 451, 457
 Anzino, Mgr., ii. 462 foll.
Apostolica sedis munus, pretended Bull,
 ii. 450
Apostolicum pascendi, the Constitution, i.
 48
 "Appellants" and "Acceptants," i. 16
 Apponyi, Count, ii. 2, 4
 Aranda, Spanish minister, i. 49, 175
 Arbués, ii. 282
 Archinto, Cardinal, i. 39
 Argenson, Marquis d', i. 26 foll., 31, 33
 Armellini, ii. 174
 Arnauld, Antoine, i. 6
 Arnim, Count, ii. 302, 335, 348, 351, 353,
 391 foll., 395 foll.
 Arnoldi, Bishop, ii. 78
 Artaud, i. 276, 277, 372; ii. 9 *note*
 Astros, Abbé d', i. 316 foll.
 Aubeterre, Marquis d', i. 59, 60, 64, 65
Auctorem fidei, Bull, i. 130
 Aude, Fabre de l', i. 270
 Audisio, ii. 192
Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, ii. 214,
 286, 300, 307, 321, 325, 336, 338,
 348
 Avanzo, Bishop d', ii. 365
Avenir, the, ii. 69 foll.
 Avian, Archbishop d', i. 301 foll.

- Avignon, taken by Louis XIV., i. 11; restored to the Papacy *ibid.*; proposal to take it, 50; annexed, 57, 60, 66, 72 foll., 77; restored again, 81; threatened, 143; renounced, 185; attempts to regain, 263, 354
- Azara, José d', i. 124, 178, 181 foll., 202
- Azeglio, Massimo d', ii. 39, 96, 98, 109, 114, 129, 135, 146, 186, 201, 208, 209, 239 foll., 251
- BADIA, PASQUALE, ii. 397
- Bajus, Michael, i. 3, 5
- Balbo, Cesare, ii. 87 foll., 114, 125, 140, 153
- Ballerini, i. 114
- Banneville, Marquis de, ii. 337, 345, 348, 350, 378 foll.
- Banzo, Antonio, engraver, i. 357
- "Barnabas Society," ii. 430
- Barnabò, Cardinal, ii. 298
- Barrot, Odilon, ii. 93, 179
- Barry, Madame du, i. 84
- Bartolucci, i. 184
- Bassinet, Abbé, i. 140
- Bassville, murdered, i. 177
- Bautain, Louis, ii. 71
- Bayer, von, ii. 307
- Beauharnais, Eugène, i. 355
- Beaumont, Archbishop de, i. 29, 30, 32, 43, 47, 82
- Beccaria, i. 169
- Beck, F. H., Jesuit, i. 114
- Beckmann, Bishop, ii. 419
- Beckx, Jesuit General, ii. 448, 457
- Bellarmino, i. 39, 81; ii. 360, 374
- Bellisomi, Cardinal, i. 201 foll.
- Benedict XIII., Pope, i. 21, 28
- XIV., Pope, i. 27, 34, 36 foll., 92 foll., 101, 366; ii. 28, 44, 424
- Benevento, i. 57, 60, 72, 202, 288, 354, 356, 373; ii. 171
- Bennigsen, ii. 434, 436
- Benvenuti, Cardinal, ii. 60, 61
- Béranger, i. 86
- Bernadotte, i. 188, 288
- Bernard, St, ii. 41
- Bernetti, Cardinal, ii. 28, 31, 34, 52, 61, 62 foll., 66, 72 foll., 99, 107, 117, 166
- Bernier, Abbé, i. 230, foll., 247, 249, 253
- Bernis, Cardinal, i. 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65 foll., 72, 84, 122, 143, 144, 165 foll., 169, 172, 174
- Berthier, General, i. 188 foll., 216, 254, 272, 307
- Berti, ii. 375
- Bertolè-Viale, ii. 425 foll.
- Beust, Count von, ii. 288, 303, 338 foll., 348, 375 foll., 396, 406, 414, 423
- Bianchi, Celestino, ii. 389
- Bible, Liguori discourages reading the, i. 108; Madiat imprisoned for reading it, ii. 184; Diodati's version, 224
- Societies, i. 366 foll.; ii. 12, 43, 61, 78, 128, 260, 431
- Bigot de Préameneu, i. 304 foll.
- Bilio, Cardinal, ii. 263, 298, 315, 354
- "Bilocation," i. 88
- Bishops, their rights, i., 112, 116; ii., 332
- Bismarck, ii. 301 foll., 314, 351, 392, 402 foll., 434, 436 foll., 441 foll., 445 foll., 449
- Bixio, General, ii. 390 foll.
- Bizzarri, Cardinal, ii. 291, 298, 315
- Bluntschli, ii. 440
- Bofondi, Giuseppe, ii. 142
- Boisgelin, de, Archbishop, i. 254
- Boissy d'Anglas, i. 153, 157, 158
- Bolgeni, Jesuit, i. 83
- Bologna, i. 178, 182; ii. 60, 66 foll.
- Bonaparte, Elise, i. 355
- , Jerome, i. 283 foll.
- , —, Prince, ii. 51
- , Joseph, i. 187 foll., 236 foll., 240, 287 foll.; ii. 126
- , Josephine, i. 243, 254, 261, 264, 269, 271 foll., 281, 302, 306
- , Letitia, i. 257, 281, 371, 375
- , Louis Napoleon (Napoleon III.), i. 230 *note*, 281; ii. 60, 62, 100, 170, 178 foll., 185 foll., 202, 204 foll., 208 foll., 212, 215, 219, 220, 221, 225, 241, 244 foll., 248 foll., 253 foll., 256, 270 foll., 273 foll., 275 foll., 283 foll., 311, 314, 346, 375 foll.
- , Lucian, ii. 126 foll., 160 foll., 170
- , Napoleon, the Great, avenges Bassville's murder, i. 177 foll.; Maury's feeling about him, 206; professes Catholicism, 219; his religion, 223 foll., 338 foll.; his Gallicanism, 228, 317; his independence, 229; first thinks of being anointed, 229; receives Consalvi, 234; anger with Consalvi over the Concordat, 238; concludes the Concordat, 240; his view of it, 244; celebrates the conclusion of it, 254; makes Italian Concordat, 260; becomes Emperor, 261; marriage, 272; coronation, 272; King of Italy, 278; relations with Pius become worse, 282 foll.; annuls his brother's marriage, 283; proposals to the Pope, 285 foll.; his Caliphate, 289, 328 foll.; liturgical changes, 291; his Catechism, 291 foll.; seizes Rome, 294; deports the cardinals, 295; excommunicated, 297; determines to divorce Josephine, 302; decree with regard to the Pope, 304; fetches the

- Bonaparte, Napoleon (*continued*)—
 cardinals to Paris, 305; marriage to Marie Louise, 307; advances towards Pius VII., 311 foll.; anger with him, 317; Russian expedition, 329, 331; makes new Concordat at Fontainebleau, 333 foll.; abdicates, 338; return to France, 355; death, 374 foll.
 —, Napoleon, Prince, i. 284 *note*; ii. 206, 209, 228, 375 foll., 380, 381, 385
 —, Pauline, i. 233, 371
 Bonghi, ii. 410, 412, 451
 Boniface VIII., introduces Jubilee, ii. 15
 Bonnechose, Cardinal, ii. 322, 346
 Borgatti, ii. 279
 Borgia, Cardinal, i. 199, 201, 270
 —, St Francis, i. 127
 Bosco, ii. 430
 Bourbon, family treaty, i. 56
 Bozino, ii. 229
 Brancadoro, Cardinal, i. 310; ii. 33
 Brandis, i. 366
 Braschi, *see* Pius VI., Pope
 —, Cardinal, i. 201, 211, 212
 Brentano, ii. 309
 Breviary, the, i. 21, 127; ii. 331
 Briefs, difference between Bulls and, i. 79
 Brienne, Loménie de, Archbishop, i. 140
 Brigandage, i. 363; ii. 22, 102, 272
 Broglie, de, Jesuit, i. 343
 —, Duc de, French Minister, ii. 265, 296, 449, 461
 Brunelli, Cardinal, ii. 192
 Brunetti, *see* Cicerauacchio
 Bruno, Dr, ii. 462 foll.
 Bunsen, i. 372; ii. 29, 44 foll., 63
 Buontempi, confessor to Clement XIV., i. 75
 Busenbaum, Jesuit moralist, i. 36, 101
 Butenjeff, ii. 147, 148
 CACAULT, i. 183, 228, 232 foll., 243, 248 *note*, 257, 258
 Cadorna, General, ii. 390 foll., 395 foll., 398
 Caffarelli, General, i. 268
 Calcagnini, i. 201, 204
 Cambacérès, i. 253
 Cambon, i. 148
 Camerata, ii. 168
 Camus, Jansenist, i. 142
 Canisius, Peter, ii. 258
 Cannonieri, ii. 51
 Canossa, Bishop, ii. 362
 Canova, sculptor, i. 190, 372, 377
 Cantù, Cesare, ii. 58 *note*, 82
 Capaccini, ii. 6, 27, 77
 Capalti, Cardinal, ii. 298, 315, 327, 341
 Capodistrias, i. 351
 Cappellari, *see* Gregory XVI., Pope
 Capponi, Gino, ii. 42, 43, 87, 97, 407, 421
 Caprara, Cardinal, i. 245, 252, 254, 261, 264 foll., 267, 283, 291, 295, 307, 358
 —, General, i. 195, 249
 Carbonari, the, i. 363, 372 foll.; ii. 9, 22 foll., 41, 48, 83 foll., 86
 Carchidio, General, ii. 391
 Cardoni, ii. 356, 360
 Carnot, i. 179, 181
 Carrillo, ii. 197
 Cartesian philosophy, i. 28
 Carvalho, Sebastian, *see* Pombal
 Caselli, Cardinal, i. 229, 283, 307, 314
 Casoni, Cardinal, i. 288, 294
 Castagnola, ii. 384, 389
 Castelfidardo, ii. 221
 Castel Gandolfo, i. 80, 85, 269, 374; ii. 169, 277, 409
 Castiglioni, *see* Pius VIII., Pope
 Castlereagh, Lord, i. 352
 Castracane, ii. 153, 167, 169
 Catechism, Bossuet's, i. 291; ii. 355
 —, Coyer's, i. 138
 —, Deharbe's, ii. 341
 —, Napoleon's, i. 291
 Catherine II. of Russia, i. 82, 171 foll.
 Caterini, ii. 192, 291, 298, 299
Catholica fidei, brief, i. 345
 Cattabene, ii. 112
 Cavaignac, ii. 158, 171, 220
 Cavalchini, Cardinal, i. 39
 Cavour, Count, ii. 201 foll., 204 foll., 208 foll., 216, 217 foll., 221, 222 foll., 230 foll., 233, 250, 448
 Celibacy of the clergy, ii. 67
 Censorship of the Press, i. 18; ii. 129, 185, 199
 Cernuschi, ii. 240
 Cesarini, Duke, ii. 399
 Chaise, Père la, i. 9, 14
Chambre du Pape, i. 18
 Charles III., King of Spain, 48 foll., 56 foll. 67, 81
 — IV., King of Spain, i. 202, 340, 372
 — VI., King of Spain, ii. 35
 — X., King of France, ii. 9, 20, 27, 46
 — Albert, of Savoy, ii. 84, 98, 105, 143, 146, 151, 152, 155, 170 foll., 173 foll.
 — Emmanuel, of Savoy, i. 340, 347, 372
 Chateaubriand, i. 258 foll., 333; ii. 3, 28, 31 foll., 35 foll., 40, 44, 87
 Chaumette, i. 154
 Chauvelin, Abbé, i. 35
 Chénier, i. 153, 154
 Chiaramonti, *see* Pius VII., Pope
 Chiephala, Captain, ii. 28

- Chigi, Mgr., ii. 245
 —, Don Mario, ii. 452
 Choiseul, Duc de, i. 31, 49, 50, 60, 66 foll., 68
 Cialdini, ii. 221, 244, 284, 380
 "Ciceruacchio" (Angelo Brunetti), ii. 126, 132, 141, 161, 168
Cicisbeati, i. 168
 Cimarosa, i. 195
 Ciofani, Abate, i. 170
Circolo Popolare, ii. 140, 162
 — *Romano*, ii. 140, 151, 161
Civiltà Cattolica, ii. 182, 249, 261, 264, 269, 273, 288, 299 foll., 308, 338, 374, 440 foll.
 Claraz, i. 330
 Clarendon, Lord, ii. 202 foll., 286, 321
 Clary, Désirée-Eugénie, i. 188
 Clement XI., Pope, i. 3, 13, 14, 16, 366
 — XIII., Pope, i. 39, 43, 45, 57, 58, 63, 113
 — XIV., Pope, 46, 47, 60, 62 foll., 65, 83, 85, 86, 334
 Clément, Bishop, i. 162
 Clifford, Bishop, ii. 454
 Clootz, Anacharsis, i. 153, 154
 Clotilde, Princess, of Savoy, ii. 206, 380
 Cobden, Richard, ii. 129
 Cobenzl, i. 239
 Coblenz, Articles of, i. 116
 Cochin, Auguste, ii. 296
Collège de France, ii. 90
 — *Louis le Grand*, i. 26, 27
Collegium Romanum, i. 77, 80, 82; ii. 13, 191, 224, 298, 447 foll.
 — *Germanicum*, i. 125; ii. 441
 Colonna, Cardinal, i. 165
 — Prince, ii. 399
 Conception, the Immaculate, *see* Mary
 Concordat, the French, i. 180 foll., 229 *note*, 230 foll., 240 foll., 375; ii. 427
 — the Italian, i. 260 foll.
 — of Fontainebleau, i. 333 foll., 375
 — with Austria, ii. 198 foll., 274, 378
 Concordats with Spain, i. 368; France, *ibid.*; Bavaria, 368; Naples, *ibid.*; the Netherlands, 369; Prussia, 370
 Condé-Bourbon, Duke of, i. 19
 Condillac, i. 28
 Congregation of the Index, ii. 41, 173, 308, 330
 — of Rites, ii. 290, 456
Congregazione degli Studii, ii. 125
 — *di Vigilanza*, ii. 25, 43
 Connolly, Archbishop, ii. 326, 358 foll., 363
 Consalvi, Ercole, Cardinal, his origin and early years, i. 192 foll.; made secretary of conclave at Venice, 192, 197; his account of it, 203 foll., 210 foll.; Secretary of State *pro tempore*, 214 foll.; Cardinal and Secretary of State, 216; his Memoirs, 229 *note*; goes to Paris to make the Concordat, 233 foll.; on the Organic Articles, 256; attacked by Napoleon, 286; sacrificed, 288; brought to Paris, 305; refuses to attend Napoleon's wedding, 307; sent to Reims, 310; attends Pius VII. at Fontainebleau, 334 foll.; last sight of Napoleon, 338; made Secretary again, 338; compared with Pacca, 342; visits England, 350; at Congress of Vienna, 351; his home government, 357; his intolerance, 365; and the later Concordats, 367 foll.; retirement, 377; violence towards Della Genga, ii. 6; interview with Leo XII. 8 foll.; death, 11
 Constitution, Civil, of the Clergy, i. 129, 142 foll., 248
Consulta, the Roman, ii. 130, 137 foll., 180
Consulturi, Bull, ii. 451
 Contarini, ii. 154
 Convention, the National, i. 148 foll.
 — the September, 251 foll., 377 foll., 386 foll.
 Coppi, ii. 29, 63 *note*, 82, 129
 Corboli-Bussi, ii. 117, 119, 122, 172
 Cordara, Jesuit, i. 51, 60, 78, 86, 100
 Cornelius, ii. 305
 Coronation of a pope, i. 213
 — of Napoleon, i. 261 foll.
 Corsi, Cardinal, ii. 287
 Corsini, Cardinal, i. 78
 — Prince ii. 141, 142, 168
 Costarosa, Maria Celeste, i. 91
 Coyer, Abbé, i. 138
 Crémieux, ii. 396
 Crétineau-Joly, i. 61, 83, 192, 229 *note*, 239 *note*; ii. 54, 99 foll.
 Crispi, ii. 463
 Cristaldi, Cardinal, ii. 33
 Crosa, Marquis, ii. 33
 Cullen, Cardinal, ii. 322, 358
 Cumming, Dr, ii. 295
 Curci, Jesuit, i. 359; ii. 98, 182, 265 *note*
 Czerniewicz, i. 172
 DAMIENS' attempt on Louis XV., i. 35, 137
 Danton, i. 149, 151
 Darboy, Archbishop, ii. 194, 269, 294, 312, 320, 324, 326, 330, 332, 338, 355, 358 foll., 363 foll., 368, 416
 Dardano, Pietro, ii. 34, 35, 38, 40, 43, 53
 Daru, Count, ii. 337, 345 foll., 349
 Daubenton, i. 14, 18

- Daubermesnil, i. 148
 David, painter, i. 154, 272
 Decazes, Duc, ii. 450
 Dechamps, Archbishop, ii. 293, 297, 308, 322, 325, 333 foll., 336, 358
 Deinlein, Bishop, ii. 418 foll.
 Deism, i. 24, 52, 154, 161
 Delacroix, i. 180
 Depretis, ii. 457
 Derenthall, ii. 439
 Desanctis, ii. 132
 Descartes, i. 52
 Despuigs y Dameto, Cardinal, i. 298
 Devoti, ii. 41
 Diderot, . 28, 29, 45, 51, 55
 Directory the, i. 160
 Döllinger, Ignatius von, on Liguori, i. 107; and Lamennais, ii. 71; on Perrone's theory of tradition, 191; lectures in the Odeon, 232; *Kirche und Kirchen*, 237; articles on the council, 300, 302; "Janus" 307; meets Dupanloup, 309; relations with Lord Acton, 321; protest against Infallibility, 336, 344; correspondence with Hefele, 419; constancy, 420; excommunication, 435 foll.; influence on Gladstone, 454
 Dominicans, the, i. 126
Dominus ac Redemptor, brief, i. 78 foll.
 Doria, Cardinal, i. 186, 202, 213, 233, 294 foll., 307, 332
 — Prince, i. 360
 —, ii. 399, 404
 Dreux-Brézé, Bishop, ii. 266
 Droste zu Vischering, Archbishop, i. 324; ii. 78
 Drouyn de l'Huys, French minister, ii. 176 foll., 248, 250, 251 foll., 255, 257
 Druhle, i. 149
 Dubois, Cardinal, i. 16, 19
 Dufaure, ii. 461
 Dumont, General, ii. 276
 Dunin, Archbishop, ii. 78
 Dupanloup, ii. 69, 90, 210, 214, 242, 243 foll., 253, 262, 266 foll., 283, 291, 292, 294, 296 foll., 300, 308, 310 foll., 312, 320, 329, 332 foll., 341, 342, 344, 353 foll., 358, 362 foll., 366 foll., 368, 370, 417, 420, 427 foll., 452 foll., 456
 Duphot, General, i. 188 foll.
 Durando, General, ii. 146 foll., 247
 Dutard, i. 150
 Duvoisin, Bishop, i. 322, 323, 324, 326, 333, 334, 336 foll.
ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL, ii. 184
 "Emancipation, Catholic," ii. 27, 44, 335
 Emery, Abbé, i. 150, 163, 164, 314, 319, 320
 Emly, Lord, ii. 296
 Ems, the "Points" of, i. 131 foll.
Encyclopædia, the, i. 29, 30
 Enghien, Duc d', i. 261
 England, i. 56, 66, 72, 183, 199, 246, 262, 266, 276, 285, 288, 329 foll., 354; ii. 11, 27, 63, 73, 174, 187, 201, 221, 392
 Espen, van, i. 110, 331
 Esterhazy, ii. 174
Etsi multa luctuosa, Encyclical, ii. 448, 450
 Eugénie, Empress, ii. 234, 240, 245, 283, 289, 377
 Expilly, Constitutional Bishop, i. 145
 FAILLY, General, ii. 284, 379
 Falconieri, Cardinal, ii. 94, 108, 112
 Falk, Dr, ii. 430, 437 foll.
 Falloux, ii. 179, 206, 265, 292, 296, 313
 Falsacappa, Cardinal, ii. 53
 Farina, La, ii. 204
 Farini, L. C., i. 362; ii. 26, 41, 74, 88, 95, 104, 129, 151, 160, 209, 215, 248, 250
 Favre, Jules, ii. 285, 387, 405 foll., 414 foll., 422 foll., 427 foll.
 Fea, ii. 8, 55
 Febronianism, i. 115 foll., 131, 370; ii. 270
 "Febronius, Justinus" (J. von Hontheim), i. 109 foll.
 Feller, F. X., Jesuit, i. 83
 Fénelon, i. 3, 13, 115, 201
 Ferdinand, Archduke, i. 129
 — I., King of Naples, i. 56
 — II., i. 345; ii. 105, 142, 165, 171
 —, Duke of Parma, i. 56
 — VII., King of Spain, i. 347
 — III., Emperor, ii. 195
 Ferrara, i. 178, 182; ii. 135 foll.
 Ferrari, ii. 298
 Ferretti, Gabriele, ii. 134 foll., 141, 142, 148 foll., 151
 —, Giovanni Mastai, *see* Pius IX., Pope
 Fesch, Cardinal, i. 257, 262, 264, 269, 272, 285, 288, 302, 304, 308, 314, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 326, 377; ii. 40
 Fessler, Bishop, ii. 316 foll., 319
 Fiano, Duchess of, ii. 399
 Filangieri, Gaetano, i. 169
 Fitzgerald, Bishop, ii. 371
 Fitz James, Bishop, attacks the Jesuits, i. 46
 Flahault, French minister, ii. 247
 Flangini, Cardinal, i. 214
 Fleury, Cardinal, i. 20, 26
 —, Claude, i. 18, 244
 —, Count, ii. 276
 Florence, church life at, i. 125
 Förster, Bishop, ii. 359, 363, 418
 Florida-Blanca, i. 173
 Forcade, Bishop, ii. 346 foll.

- Fornari, Cardinal, ii. 261
 Forwerk, Bishop, ii. 418
 Fouché, i. 285, 300, 307, 309
 Foulon, Bishop, ii. 368
 Fourcroy, i. 158
 Fournier, ii. 450
 France, church of, before the Revolution, i. 138 foll.
Français, le, ii. 300 foll.
 Franchi, Cardinal, ii. 312
 Francis, I., of Austria, i. 268, 371
 —, IV., of Modena, ii. 57, 59
 —, I., of Naples, ii. 19
 —, II., of Naples, ii. 217, 227
 — Joseph, Emperor of Austria, ii. 198 foll., 274, 288, 376, 378, 396, 420, 448
 —, of Sales, i. 97; ii. 373, 462
 Franzelin, Cardinal, ii. 298, 357
 Franzoni, Archbishop, ii. 200 foll.
 Frascati, i. 70, 193
 Frederick II., of Prussia, i. 82, 83, 121, 170; ii. 44
 — William IV., of Prussia, ii. 78
 Freemasons, i. 136, 363; ii. 23, 331
 Freppel, Bishop, ii. 310, 352, 449
 Friedrich, Professor, ii. 321, 325, 435
 Frimont, General, ii. 61
 Fulda, meetings at, ii. 309, 418
 Fuscaldo, Marchese, ii. 4, 5
 Fusciani, ii. 162, 168
- GADDA, ii. 404
 Galeffi, Cardinal, i. 307; ii. 1, 39, 56 foll.
 Galeotti, ii. 118
 Galeppi, i. 183
 Galletti, ii. 144, 163, 168
 Gallicanism, i. 7 foll.; the Gallican propositions, 10, 12, 44, 160, 251, 253, 277, 319, 320, 332, foll.; ii. 299; Honthelm influenced by, i. 110; Gallican Council, 163; loses hold in France, ii. 89; Guéranger on, 343
 —, in Italy, 282
 Gallo, del, ii., 395
 Galvani, i. 169; ii. 26
 Gamberini, ii. 73, 74
 Gambetta, ii. 428, 461
 Ganganelli, *see* Clement XIV., Pope
 Garampi, i. 170
 Garibaldi, Giuseppe, ii. 158, 168, 220, 240, 244, 247, 250, 257, 280, 282 foll., 284 foll., 379, 380, 402
 —, Menotti, ii. 283
 Gasser, Bishop, ii. 330, 365
 Gaume, Abbé, ii. 268
 Gavazzi, Father, i. 207 *note*; ii. 16, 132, 158, 181 foll.
 Gay, Abbé, ii. 298
 Gaysruck, Cardinal, ii. 58, 110
- Genga, della, *see* Leo XII., Pope
 —, della, Cardinal ii. 177 foll.
 Gennarelli, ii. 228
 Genovesi, Antonio, i. 168
 George IV., King of England, i. 350, 351, 375; ii. 11
 Georgi, Augustinian, i. 65
 Gerbet, Bishop, ii. 262
 Gerdil, Cardinal, i. 201
 "Gesù," at Rome, i. 78, 345; ii. 79, 145
 Ghislieri, Marchese, i. 215, 216
 Giacomo, Frà, ii. 233
 Giannelli, Cardinal, ii. 291
 Giannone, Pietro, i. 168
 Ginouilhac, Bishop, ii. 368
 Gioberti, Vincenzo, ii. 87 foll., 98, 114, 130, 142, 150, 151 foll., 155, 170 foll.
 Giraud, Cardinal, ii. 130
 Giusti, Giuseppe, ii. 115
 Giustiniani, Cardinal, ii. 33 fdl., 53, 55 foll.
 Gizzi, Cardinal, ii. 94, 107, 109, 117, 121 foll., 124, 125, 128, 130, 131, 133 foll., 151, 166
 Gladstone, William Ewart, ii. 215, 286, 321, 406, 453 foll.
 Gleichen, Baron von, i. 41, 86
 Gobel, Archbishop and apostate, i. 146, 152, 154
 Görres, Joseph, ii. 71, 78
 Govone, ii. 388
 Gramont, Duc, de, ii. 213, 217, 219, 222, 225 *note*, 227, 228, 231, 234, 246 foll., 376 foll., 378 foll.
 Granada, tablets of, ii. 189
 Grandoni, ii. 161
 Grassellini, ii. 132
 Gratry, Père, ii. 334, 420
 Graziosi, ii. 117, 258
 Grégoire, Bishop, i. 129, 130, 139, 145, 146, 148 foll., 152, 155 foll., 162, 163, 181, 228, 235, 247
 "Gregorianism," ii. 107, 115, 123, 131, 134, 178
 Gregorio, Cardinal di, ii. 1, 33 foll., 38, 52 foll.
 Gregorovius, i. 378; ii. 204, 222, 282
 Gregory XVI., Pope, ii. 33, 38; his earlier career 53 foll.; election, 57; and revolutions, 58 foll.; invokes Austrian aid, 61; reforms demanded of him by the Powers, 63; foreign policy, 64; government, 65, 75; encyclical *Mirari vos*, 67; and Lamennais, 69; and the Immaculate Conception, 76 foll., 190; his progress, 80; culture under him, 81 foll.; last interview with Crétineau-Joly, 99; death, 100; obsequies, 106

- Greith, Bishop, ii. 362, 418 foll.
 Grimm, i. 55
 Grotius, Hugo, i. 110
 Guarantees, law of, ii. 279, 400, 407 foll.
 Guelphism, New, ii. 86, 114, 119, 123, 124, 136, 140, 152, 210
 Guéranger, Dom, i. 71; ii. 185, 342 foll.
 Guéronnière, La, ii. 206, 211 foll., 216, 226
 Guettée, Abbé, ii. 197
 Guibert, Cardinal, ii. 262, 266, 291
 Guidi, Cardinal, ii. 360 foll., 372
 Guizot, French minister, ii. 85, 90, 120, 137, 139, 314, 346
 Gustavus Adolphus Society, ii. 295
- HANEBERG, ii. 301
 Harcourt, Duc d', ii. 158, 164, 171, 175, 177
 —, Count d', ii. 415 foll., 426
 Hase, Karl, ii. 50
 Hauranne, Jean de Vergier de, i. 4
 Haussonville, d', i. 249, 289, 330, 334; ii. 88
 Hauterive, Blanc d', i. 237 foll.
 Haüy, Valentin, i. 161
 Haynald, Cardinal, ii. 326, 329, 330, 341, 358, 362 foll., 367, 368, 370
 Heart Sacred, of Jesus, i. 74, 126, 343, 344; ii. 28, 98, 145, 155, 189, 258, 425, 449, 456
 —, of Mary, ii. 189
 Hefele, Bishop, ii. 298, 309, 315, 329, 344, 354 foll., 358, 363, 367, 368, 418, 419 foll.
 Helvetius, i. 28, 42, 53, 135
 Henry, Cardinal of York, i. 193, 197, 199, 201, 281
 Herbst, ii. 274
 Hergenröther, ii. 307
 Hermes, Georg, ii. 71
 Hettinger, ii. 298
 Hilliers, Baraguay d', General, ii. 181
 Hoffbauer, Cl. Maria, i. 96, 208
 Hohenlohe, Cardinal, ii. 325, 326, 331, 370, 372, 435, 439
 —, Chancellor, ii. 301 foll. 306, 314, 348
 Hohenwart, Archbishop, i. 306
 Holbach, Baron, i. 28
 Hompesch, ii. 305
 Honorius I., ii. 344, 358, 365
 Hontheim, *see* Febronius
 Hrzan-Haras, Cardinal, i. 118, 200 foll., 215
 Huber, Johann, ii. 307, 308
 Hübner, Baron, ii. 292
 Hyacinthe, Père, ii. 310
- "ILLUMINATI," the, i. 135 foll., 168
 Illuminati, conspirator, i. 372
 Incontri, Bishop, ii. 112, 116
 Index, the, i. 71, 349; ii. 68, 157 *note*, 173, 196, 308
Ineffabilis Deus, Bull, ii. 194
 Infallibility of the Pope, Innocent X. on, i. 6; not to be taught in France, 12; supported there by authority, 19; Liguori on, 106; dogma piloted by Immaculate Conception, ii. 195, 293; "a Protestant invention," 335; discussion of, 291 foll.; proclamation of, 370; definition of, 373 foll.; Gladstone on, 454
In hac sublimi, Bull, ii. 451
 Innocent X, Pope, i. 6
 —, XI., Pope, i. 9, 11; ii. 189
 —, XII., Pope, i. 12
 Inquisition, the, i. 71, 169, 284, 349; ii. 75, 82, 154, 282, 331
 Isabella, Queen of Spain, ii. 53, 195, 217
 Isabey, painter, i. 272
 Isaia, Antonio, ii. 229 foll.
 Italy, "a geographical expression," ii. 136; Young, ii. 83 foll., 86, 93
- JANSEN, CORNELIUS, i. 3; his *Augustinus*, 4
 Jansenism, conflict with, i. 12 foll., 17; extreme utterances of, 22; consequences of, 23; persecution of, 30; in Italy, 125, 127; of the Constitutional clergy, 247; and the Bible, 366; in Spain and Portugal, 374; in Holland, ii. 28
 "Janus," ii. 307 foll.; 336
 Japanese martyrs canonised, ii. 242 foll.
 Jesuits defend Louis XIV., i. 9; contend against Jansenism, 14 foll.; the conflict renewed, 30; trading operations, 37, 43; expelled from Portugal, 42; condemned in France, 44; dissolved in France, 47; opposition to them in Spain, 48; ejected from that country, 49; from Naples, 51; philosophic sympathy with them, 52; abolition demanded, 57; their influence under Clement XIII., 63; Clement XIV.'s fear of them, 66; abolition of the order, 78; continue in Prussia and Russia, 82 foll.; related to the Redemptorists, 97; Pius VI. wishes to restore them, 169 foll.; Pius VII. restores them, 343 foll.; expelled from Russia, 348; influence upon Leo XII., ii. 12 foll.; under Pius VIII., 48 foll.; under Gregory XVI., 74, 79; driven out of France, 89 foll.; Gioberti's polemic against them, 98, 130; expelled from Rome, 145;

Jesuits (*continued*)—

drawn into close relations with Pius IX., 182, 273; and Manning, 374; Pius asserts his independence of, 413; banished from Germany, 440

Jesus, the Sacred Heart of, *see* Heart

—, Fathers of the Faith of, i. 344, 348

Jews, i. 119, 349; ii. 24, 295

Joan of Arc, ii. 452

John, King of Saxony, ii. 306, 412

Jörg, ii. 305

Joseph, St, ii. 373, 412

—, King of Portugal, i. 40, 51

— II., Emperor, visits the Conclave, i. 59, 64; and the Articles of Coblenz, 116; his tolerance, 117; his reforms, 118 foll.; receives Pius VI. at Vienna, 122; continues reforms, 124; and the Points of Ems, 132; Della Genga's sermon on him, ii. 5

Josephinism, i. 127; ii. 19, 146, 184, 198, 223, 289

Jubilee, year of, i. 175; ii. 9, 14 foll., 30

Julian, Franciscan Saint, ii. 21

July, ordinances and revolution of, ii. 37, 46, 59, 83

KAMPSCHULTE, ii. 305

Kanzler, General, ii. 285, 391 foll.

Kaunitz, Austrian minister, i. 122 foll., 124, 245 *note*

Kenrick, ii. 328, 344, 368

Ketteler, Bishop von, ii. 274, 297, 304, 308, 309 foll., 325, 332, 336, 364 foll., 369 foll., 418, 424, 437, 446

Krementsz, ii. 328, 368, 437, 442 foll.

Krüdener, Frau von, i. 364

Küchler, A., painter, ii. 81

Kulmann, ii. 445

Kulturkampf, the, ii. 274, 396, 430, 433 foll., 442 foll., 448, 449

LABORDE, Abbé, i. 103, 196

Labre, Saint B. J., i. 149, 174

Lachat, Bishop, ii. 448

Lacordaire, Père, ii. 69, 215

Ladoue, Bishop, ii. 460

Lambertini, Prosper, *see* Benedict XIV., Pope

—, Countess, ii. 457

Lambruschini, Cardinal, ii. 37, 46, 74 foll., 80, 82 foll., 91 foll., 96, 100, 107 foll., 110, 117, 128, 133, 163, 166

Lamennais, i. 348; ii. 20, 69 foll., 262

Lamoricière, General, ii. 220 foll., 226

Landriot, Archbishop, ii. 372

Langrand-Dumanceau, banker, ii. 280

Lanza, Giovanni, ii. 375, 380 foll., 384, 385, 387 foll., 404, 408, 421, 426, 430, 432 foll., 447

Laouénan, Bishop, ii. 346

Lareveillère-Lépeaux, i. 161, 162, 179, 186

Latour-Maubourg, ii. 48, 52, 58, 73, 89, 90

— d'Auvergne, ii. 253, 311

Lavigerie, Cardinal, ii. 338, 417

Law, John, i. 17

Lebzelter, Ritter von, i. 311 foll.

Lecoz, Bishop, i. 162

Ledochowski, Cardinal, ii. 402, 444, 456

Legations, the, i. 197, 203, 215, 245, 255, 263, 353 foll., 356 foll., 360, 373; ii. 48, 66, 80, 106, 117, 124, 202, 209, 213, 217

Lejeune, Jansenist, i. 174

Lenormand, ii. 90

Lenti, Mgr., ii. 462

Leo XII., Pope, i. 349, 362; ii. 1, 3; his election and early life, 5; desires interview with Consalvi, 8; encyclical on his accession, 12; his austerity, 13; his jubilee, 14 foll.; his admiration for Lamennais, 20; his government, 22 foll.; foreign relations, 26 foll.; death, 29; connexion with Pius IX., 112, 113

— XIII., Pope, i. 98, 106; ii. 1 *note*, 39, 40, 41, 46, 53, 58, 151, 261, 354, 412, 420, 464 foll.

Leopold II., Emperor, i. 59, 124 foll.

— II., Grand Duke of Tuscany, ii. 184

Less, i. 5

Lesseps, Ferdinand, ii. 176

"Leto, Pomponio," ii. 320, 322, 332, 361, 366

Liberatore, ii. 293, 358

Licet per apostolicas, Bull, ii. 451

Liguori, Alfonso M. de', i. 48, 88 foll., 114; ii. 49, 50, 76, 334, 413

Lisbon, earthquake of, i. 38

Liverani, ii. 237

Lorenzana, Cardinal, i. 202

Louis, of Bavaria, i. 372

— XIV. of France, i. 1; favours the Jesuits, 2; upholds Gallicanism, 8 foll.

— XV., i. 18, 30, 33, 34, 35, 45, 47, 56 foll., 81, 82, 137

— XVI., i. 84, 143 foll., 146, 147

— XVIII., i. 198, 204 foll., 221, 246, 262, 351, 355, 374, 376; ii. 6, 9, 27

— of Portugal, ii. 234

Louise, Madame, i. 81, 83

Louis Philippe, i. 374; ii. 47 foll., 53, 58, 73, 89, 92, 143, 146

Lourdes, grotto of, ii. 197

Luca, de, Cardinal, ii. 298, 315, 326, 327, 332

Ludolph, ii. 175

Luneville, Peace of, i. 354

- Lutz, von, ii. 435
 Lützow, Count, ii. 35, 123, 128, 133
 Lyonnet, Archbishop, ii. 417
 Lyons, Lord, ii. 203
- MACCHI, Cardinal, ii. 52, 56 foll., 107, 117, 193
 MacCloskey, ii. 325
 Macedonio, i. 77, 78
 MacHale, ii. 358, 363
 MacMahon, Marshal, ii. 380, 448 foll., 460 foll.
 Mai, Cardinal Angelo, ii. 30, 81, 172
 Maimbourg, Louis, Jesuit, i. 9
 Maintenon, Madame de, i. 2
 Maistre, J. de, i. 140, 275, 342, 348; ii. 349
 Majunke, ii. 274
 Malagrida, Jesuit, i. 41
 Malaret, ii. 252, 257
 Mallinckrodt, ii. 403
 Mamachi, i. 77, 114, 168
 Mamiani, Terenzio, ii. 149, 150 foll., 163
 Mancini, ii. 381 foll., 384, 433, 457, 459 foll.
 — Felicità, ii. 131
 Manfredini, i. 178
 Manin, Daniel, ii. 204
 Manning, Cardinal, i. 104; ii. 141, 145, 215 foll., 269, 281, 286, 292, 293 foll., 295, 297, 314, 316, 320 foll., 322, 329, 336, 345, 352, 357, 358, 369 foll., 374, 454 foll., 456, 458, 464
 Manzoni, poet, i. 376; ii. 85, 96
 Marais, Mathieu, i. 18
 Marchetti, ii. 115, 118, 151
 Marchi, ii. 82
 Marchionne, Carlo, architect, i. 176
 Marconi, i. 174
 Maret, Bishop, ii. 310, 320, 362 foll., 368, 417
 Margotti, ii. 188, 356 foll.
 Marheineke, ii. 190 *note*
 Maria of Agreda, i. 70
 — Christina of Spain, ii. 53
 — da Gloria, ii. 65
 — Pia of Savoy, ii. 234, 271
 — Theresa, Empress, i. 57, 64, 77, 117, 121
 Marie Anna, Archduchess, i. 344
 — Antoinette, Queen of France, i. 139
 — Leczinska, Queen of France, i. 19
 — Louise, Empress of the French, i. 303 foll., 306 foll., 311
 — — Infanta, Queen of Etruria, i. 340, 355
 Marinelli, ii. 462
 Marmont, i. 185
 Marmora, General La, ii. 208, 256, 271, 284, 379, 388, 390, 398, 403, 422, 462
- Marriage questions, i. 119, 133, 279, 301 foll.; ii. 44 foll., 67 foll., 78, 198, 288
 Martin, Bishop, ii. 310, 322, 327, 328, 339, 444
 Martinelli, ii. 298
 Martiniana, Cardinal, i. 220 foll.
 Martinique, Jesuit trading station, i. 43
 Mary, the Virgin, miracle of, i. 91; Liguori on, 93 foll., 104 foll.; girdle of, 129; picture of, ii. 79; of Einsiedeln, 99; Immaculate Conception of, i. 70 foll., ii. 76 foll., 184, 188 foll., 197, 261, 293, 373, 420, 454
 Massari, ii. 271, 286 foll., 463
 Massillon, i. 20
 Massimo, Cardinal, ii. 94 foll., 132
 Mastai, Gabriello, ii. 116
 —, Giovanni, *see* Pius IX., Pope
 Mathieu, Cardinal, ii. 266, 341, 359, 363
 Mattei, Cardinal, i. 182 foll., 200 foll., 307, 309, 340; ii. 74, 80, 117
 Maundy Thursday Bull (*In cena Domini*), i. 48, 56, 69
 Maury, Cardinal, i. 134, 151 foll., 201, 204 foll., 221, 245 *note*, 307, 315, 323, 327 foll., 336
 Max Franz, Elector of Cologne, i. 133, 135
 May devotions, ii. 197
 — Laws, in Germany, ii. 442 foll.
 — Laws, in Italy, ii. 459 foll.
 Mazzini, Giuseppe, ii. 75, 83 foll., 93 foll., 128, 139 foll., 160, 168, 174, 240, 249 foll., 254, 270, 380, 422, 433
 Meglia, ii. 305, 306, 406
 Melchers, Cardinal, ii. 305, 332, 369 foll., 418, 419
 Melzi, i. 260, 278
 Menabrea, General, ii. 285 foll., 287, 422
 Menotti, Ciro, ii. 59
 Menou, General, i. 226
 Mermillod, Bishop, ii. 268, 313, 315, 325, 328, 345, 352, 358, 448
 Mérode, Mgr. de, ii. 222, 250 foll., 272, 370, 372
 Metternich, Prince, i. 303, 311, 346, 354, 367, 370, 371; ii. 2, 40, 58, 59, 61, 64, 73, 100, 110, 115, 120 foll., 123, 123, 134, 136 foll., 139 foll., 147, 169, 183, 186, 376, 423, 424
 Mettrie, La, i. 28
 Meurthe, Boulay de la, i. 181, 230 *note*
 Meyendorff, ii. 273
 Mezzofanti, Cardinal, ii. 81, 125, 144
 Micara, Cardinal, ii. 55, 56, 105, 107, 110, 125 foll.
 Michele a Ripa, San, i. 194
 Miguel, Dom, of Portugal, ii. 64 foll.
 Milesi, Cardinal, ii. 207
 Minghetti, ii. 118, 128, 137 foll., 143,

- Minghetti (*continued*)
 144, 145, 147 foll., 162, 203, 210, 304,
 410, 447, 453, 457
 Minto, Lord, ii. 139
 Miollis, Bishop, i. 327
 — General, i. 294, 296, 298, 299,
 305
 Miot, i. 182
 Mirabeau, i. 143, 201, 231
Mirari vos, encyclical, ii. 67 foll., 267
 Molé, Count, ii. 47
 Molina, i. 5
 Molitor, ii. 310
 Moltke, Count von, ii. 110, 421
 Moniño, Don Jose, i. 74 foll., 86, 171
Moniteur, *le*, i. 156, 163, 177, 188, 227,
 237, 248, 258, 275, 276, 288, 300, 317,
 322; ii. 219, 241, 246, 265, 340
 Montaigne, i. 24
 Montalembert, ii. 69, 85, 89, 180, 211,
 263, 265, 294, 296, 305, 311, 334, 344
 Montanari, Antonio, ii. 156, 167
 Montefeltro, Lante di, ii. 140
 Montesquieu, i. 25
 Montfaucon, i. 36
 Monti, Vincenzo, ii. 85
 Morelles, Abbé, i. 53
 Moreno, ii. 322
 Morichini, ii. 144
 Moroni, Gaetano, ii. 55 foll., 81 foll.
 Mortara, Edgardo, Jewish convert, ii. 205
 Moustier, Marquis de, ii. 279, 282 foll.,
 286
 Mozart, i. 133
 Muccioli, preacher, ii. 17
 Mühler, von, ii. 314, 437
 Müller, Diamilla, ii. 249, 254, 397
 Murat, Joachim, King of Naples, i. 233,
 298, 340, 355 foll.; ii. 90, 112, 118
 Muratori, scholar, ii. 184
 —, captain of volunteers, ii. 94
 Muzzarelli, ii. 161 foll., 163, 166
- NANTES, revocation of the Edict of, i. 3,
 11, 108
 Naples, papal claims on, i. 170, 287, 340
 Napoleon, St., i. 290 foll.
 Napoleon, *see* under Bonaparte
 Nardi, Francesco, ii. 454
 Negrone, i. 192, 194
 Newman, John Henry, i. 103; ii. 269,
 297, 335, 344, 455
 Niccolini, poet, ii. 86
 Nicotera, ii. 381, 457
 Niebuhr, i. 365, 370, 372
 Nigra, ii. 251, 278 foll., 375 *note*, 376,
 379, 387, 424
 Noailles, Cardinal de, i. 15, 20
 Non-intervention, principle of, ii. 260
 Nuntiatures, i. 131
- O'CALLAGHAN, ii. 455
 O'Connell, ii. 133
 Odescalchi, Cardinal, ii. 49
 — Don Baldassare, ii. 399
 Old Catholics, i. 159; ii. 28, 436, 437,
 440, 448
 Ollivier, Emile, ii. 248, 296, 303, 337
 foll., 345 foll., 349 foll., 380
 Onesti, Count, i. 123
 Opizzoni, Cardinal, i. 307, 308; ii. 107
 "Organic Articles," the, i. 240, 250, 255
 262, 263, 267, 277, 370; ii. 186, 219
 Orioli, ii. 129, 150
 Orleans, Philip, Duke of, i. 15 foll
 Orsini, ii. 204
 Overbeck, painter, i. 372; ii. 81
 Oudinot, General, ii. 175 foll., 178
 Ozanam, Frederick, ii. 47
- PACCA, Cardinal, i. 133, 295 foll., 310,
 331, 332, 333, 334, 340, 342 foll., 345,
 358, 362; ii. 1, 3, 6, 18, 33, 37, 52
 foll., 70
 Paccanari, Niccolò, i. 344
Pacifici, or *Santa Unione*, i. 363
 Pagani, ii. 224
 Palafox, Juan de, i. 74, 169
 Pallavicini, Colonel, ii. 244 foll.
 — Princess, ii. 399
 Palma, ii. 162
 Palmerston, Lord, ii. 174, 184, 247
 Palomba, ii. 378
 Pancemont, Bishop, i. 249
 Panebianco, Cardinal, ii. 291, 298
 Pantaleoni, ii. 160, 224 foll., 230 foll.
 Paolo fuori le Mura, S., i. 376
 Papal States, condition of, in 1846, ii.
 102 foll.
 Paraguay, i. 37, 38; ii. 27
 Paris, Abbé, i. 24
 — Congress of, ii. 202
 Parisi, i. 86
 Parma, i. 56 foll., 64, 166, 354; ii. 146,
 216
 Pascal, Blaise, i. 6; ii. 308
 Pasolini, Giuseppe, ii. 74 *note*, 114, 130,
 143, 148 foll., 156, 161 foll., 203, 207,
 248
 Pasquier, Chancellor, i. 255, 315
 Pasquinades, i. 167; ii. 31, 50, 242
 Passaglia, Carlo, ii. 192, 193, 224 foll.,
 230 foll., 234 foll., 262, 263
 Passavalli, ii. 319, 370
 Passionei, Cardinal, i. 36, 37, 39
Pastor aeternus, constitution, ii. 373
 foll., 435
 Patrizi, Cardinal, ii. 291, 298, 413, 458
 Paul III., Pope, i. 50, 56
 — I., of Russia, i. 198, 345
 Payá y Rico, Bishop, ii. 362

Pecci, Gioacchino, *see* Leo XIII., Pope
 — Giuseppe, ii. 298
 Pedro I., of Brazil, ii. 27
 Pellegrini, ii. 22
 Pellico, Silvio, ii. 82, 87
 — Francesco, ii. 98
 Pepe, Francesco, i. 104
 Pepoli, Marchese, ii. 251, 256
 — Letizia, ii. 118
 Périer, Casimir, ii. 62, 66, 134
 Perraud, Charles, ii. 344
 Perrone, theologian, ii. 71, 191, 192, 262, 298
Petite Eglise, la, i. 257
 Pey, i. 343
 Philip IV., of Spain, i. 5
 Piansani, ii. 465
 Pie, Cardinal, ii. 210, 214, 219, 241, 263 foll., 265 foll., 268, 282, 292 foll., 324, 330, 343, 352, 353, 357 foll., 366, 371
 Pierracchi, Count, i. 179 foll., 182
 Pietro, Cardinal di, i. 202, 305 foll., 332, 335, 336
 Pignotti, Lorenzo, i. 178
 Pinelli, ii. 201
 Pisanelli, ii., 256
 Pistoja, synod of, i. 128
 Pithou, i. 7
 Pitra, Cardinal, ii. 343
 Pitt, William (the elder), i. 66
 Pius VI. Pope, i. 74, 96 foll., 121; his vanity, 166, 170, 175 foll.; his visit to Vienna, 122 foll.; Leopold II. on, 128; and the Civil Constitution, 143; his election, 166; and the Jesuits, 169 foll.; his home government, 175; buildings, 176; troubles with France, 177 foll.; carried off from Rome, 189; death at Valence, 190; patronises Consalvi, 194, 195; last interview with Consalvi, 197; and the Paccanarists, 344; encourages reading the Bible, 366; favours Della Genga, ii. 5 foll.
 — VII., Pope, i. 98, 130, 202, 206; his early life, 207 foll.; Bonaparte praises him, 208; "Jacobin" sermon at Imola, 208 foll.; his election, 212; voyage to Rome, 216; feeling for Napoleon, 242, 257; feeling for Talleyrand, 257; goes to Paris to crown Napoleon, 269; the coronation, 272; his vexation, 275; his popularity at Paris, 271, 276; attempt to keep him there, 277; returns to Rome, 281; estrangement from Napoleon begins, 284; rejects his proposals, 287; sacrifices Consalvi, 288; breaks off relations with France, 295; excommunicates Napoleon, 297;

carried captive, 299; imprisonment at Savona, 310 foll.; severity of it increased, 317; gives way, 321; conveyed to Fontainebleau, 330; signs the Concordat there, 334; revokes it, 335; his release, 337; return to Rome, 340; restores the Jesuits, 343 foll.; flight during the 100 days, 355; condemns the Bible Societies, 367; anxiety for Napoleon, 374; last illness and death, 376 foll.; his catafalque, ii. 12
 Pius VIII., Pope, i. 362; ii. 3 foll., 11, 29, 33 foll., 36; his election, 39; his soft heart, 39, 46, 50; his earlier life, 41; his government, 43; his attitude towards mixed marriages, 45; foreign policy, 46 foll.; and the Jesuits, 48; death, 50
 — IX., Pope, i. 71, 98 foll.; ii. 28, 75, 94, 100, 107; his election, 108; his personal appearance, 110; his earlier career, 110 foll.; his liberalism, 114; opinions of him, 115 foll.; coronation, 116; forms a council, 117; his popularity, 117 foll.; grants an amnesty, 120; and the New Guelphism, 123 foll.; his reforms, 125 foll.; represses demonstrations, 127; forms a ministry, 131; begins to draw back, 132; at issue with Austria, 136; his *Consulta di Stato*, 137; admits lay ministers, 140, 143; loss of popularity, 141; blesses Italy, 143; grants a Constitution, 144; goes to war with Austria, 146; abandons the cause of Italy, 148; turns to Rosmini, 153; makes Rossi minister, 156; revolution at Rome, 161; flight to Gaëta, 164; appoints a regency, 167; appeals for help to France, 171; obtains it, 175; receives the keys of Rome, 177; advice of Louis Napoleon, 179; leaves Gaëta, 179; returns to Rome, 181; establishes close relations with the Jesuits, 182; sets up English hierarchy, 183; makes various concordats, 184; invited to crown Napoleon III., 186; bad government, 187; determines to proclaim the Immaculate Conception, 188 foll.; the Bull, 193 foll.; reception of the dogma, 195 foll.; Concordat with Austria, 198; difficulties with Sardinia, 200 foll.; tour through the provinces, 203; revolution in the Legations, 207; papal protest, 208; proposals of Napoleon, 209 foll.; repudiated, 212 foll.; renewed, 217; overtures from Victor Emmanuel, 217;

Pius IX (*continued*)—

refused, 218; prepares for war with Sardinia, 220; defeated, 221; exchanges letters with Napoleon, 226; thinks of flight, 227; utterly refuses reconciliation with Italy, 231; words on hearing of Cavour's death, 233; asserts absolute necessity of temporal power, 242; canonises Japanese martyrs, 242 foll.; indignant with the September Convention, 253; beatifies P. Canisius and M. M. Alacoque, 258; publishes Encyclical and Syllabus, 258 foll.; views on religious liberty, 263; complains to Victor Emmanuel's daughter, 271; troubles with Russia, 273; obtains mercenary troops from France, 273; blesses the Antibes Legion, 275; *modus vivendi* with Sardinia, 277; celebrates 1800th anniversary of St Peter, 281; interview with English statesmen, 286; views on new Austrian Constitution, 288 foll.; first thinks of holding a General Council, 290; influenced by A.M. Taigi, 293; wishes to define Infallibility, 293; invites to the Council, 294; disavows the *Civiltà*, 300; condemns "Janus," 308; celebrates his priestly jubilee, 315; presides at preliminary meeting of the Council, 315; imposes restrictions upon it, 316; his expectations, 318; instructions to Passavalli, 319; receives homage of the Council, 319; believes in Infallibility, 323; interview with Ketteler, 325; stigmatises the opponents, 329; reprimands Oriental patriarch, 333; his views of the opposition, 334, 340; thanks Guéranger for pamphlet, 343; his opinion of Montalembert, 344; of Ollivier, 346; refuses requests of France at the Council, 348; correspondence with Dupanloup, 354; compliments Pie, 358; dismisses Theiner, 360; anger with Guidi, 361; with opposition, 361; blesses Payá y Rico, 362; receives deputations, 364 foll.; annoyed with Dupanloup, 368; confirms the dogma, 371, foll.; interview with San Martino, 389; determines to defend Rome, 390 foll.; conduct on day of attack, 393 foll.; next day, 395; reported to intend flight, 397; denounces the annexation, 400; his "imprisonment," 401, 415, foll.; offers to mediate between France and Germany, 402; declines Conference on the Roman question, 406; pays honours to St Joseph, 412; and to Liguori,

413; on law of guarantees, 413; opposes *Roma capitale* with moderation, 415; on Darboy's death, 417; on Lavigerie, 417; attains the years of Peter, 424; inclined to welcome message from Victor Emmanuel, 426, 429; violent language, 429, 431; disregards law of guarantees, 430; on the *Kulturkampf*, 433; speech on the "Colossus," 441; appeals to William I., 444; denounces the May laws, 445; his garrulity, 447, 458; his distress, 448; resents the thought of reconciliation, 450; arranges for successor's election, 451; protests against Italian action, 452; receives Dupanloup, 452; denounces new heathenism, 456; on death of Antonelli, 457; appoints Simeoni Secretary, 458; denounces Italian legislation, 459; keeps episcopal jubilee, 461; pays honour to Francis de Sales, 462; on death of Victor Emmanuel, 462 foll.; re-establishes Scottish hierarchy, 463; his death, 464.

Plantier, Bishop, ii. 291, 294

Plombières, meeting of Napoleon III. and Cavour at, ii. 205 foll.

Polignac, ii. 46

Poloni, Pinto, i. 211

Pombal, Marquis of, Portuguese minister, i. 37, 40, 50, 171

Pompador, Madame de, i. 31, 32, 34, 35

Pompignon, Lefranc de, i. 43

Pontecorvo, *see* Benevento

Pontine marshes, drained, i. 175 foll.

Portalis, French minister, i. 245, 250, 278 foll., 290, 369; ii. 33

Port Royal, i. 12, 13, 45

Portugal, i. 37 foll.

Postquam Dei munere, Bull, ii. 400

Pozzobonelli, Cardinal, i. 61, 63

Pradt, Abbé de, i. 217, 242, 323, 324

Press, freedom of the, i. 118, 353; ii. 68 foll., 72, 173, 259, 267, 288, 300

Probabilism, i. 74, 100 foll.; ii. 235

Prussia, i. 66, 72, 124, 370; ii. 44, 78, 273, 301 foll.

QUANTA CURA, encyclical, ii. 258, 290

Quélen, Archbishop de, ii. 48, 71

Quesnel, Paschase, i. 14

Qui pluribus, encyclical, ii. 127

"Quirinus," ii. 359

Quod divina sapientia, Bull, ii. 13

Quod nunquam, encyclical, ii. 445

RABELAIS, i. 24

Radet, i. 299 foll.

- Radetzky, ii. 66, 104, 123
 Ranaldi, ii. 25
 Ratisbonne, Alphonse de, Jewish convert, ii. 76
 Rattazzi, Italian minister, ii. 201, 208, 240, 280, 282 foll., 380, 382, 384, 422
 Rauscher, Cardinal, ii. 198, 288, 326, 327, 329, 341, 344, 354, 358 foll., 363, 365, 369, 418 foll.
 Ravnigan, Père, ii. 90
 Rayneval, Count de, ii. 175, 178, 203
 Reason, Goddess of, i. 153 foll.
 Récamier, Madame, ii. 36, 40
 Redemptorists, the, i. 93 foll., 343; ii. 440
Régale, droit de, i. 9
 Reichensperger, ii. 305, 440
 Reinkens, Old Catholic Bishop, ii. 420, 448
 Reisach, Cardinal, ii. 71, 227, 291, 298, 315, 317, 326
 Rémusat, de, French minister, ii. 428
 — Madamede, i. 272 note, 274 note, 376
Rescriptentes ea omnia, encyclical, ii. 400 foll.
 Reumont, von., ii. 59, 181
 Reusch, F. H., Old Catholic, ii. 305, 419
Revue Catholique, ii. 308
 Rewbell, i. 179
 Rezonico, *see* Clement XIII., Pope
 — Cardinal, i. 58, 61, 63, 170
 Riario-Sforza, Cardinal, ii. 109, 131, 322
 Ribotti, ii. 94
 Ricasoli, Baron, Italian minister, ii. 240, 277, 280, 380, 383, 389, 396, 407, 422
 Ricci, Lorenzo, Jesuit General, i. 39, 44, 45, 48, 58, 59, 78, 126, 165, 169, 344
 — Scipione de', Bishop, i. 125 foll., 158, 281
 Ricciardi, ii. 320
 Riccio, Bishop, ii. 371
 Richelieu, Cardinal, i. 4, 8
 Ricotti, ii. 388, 391
 Rignano, Duke M. Massimo di, ii. 393, 397
 Rivarola, Cardinal, i. 343, 349, 361; ii. 23 foll., 31
 Rivet, Bishop, ii. 364
 Robespierre, i. 149, 150, 151, 154, 227
 Rochefort, Desbois de, Bishop, i. 155
 Rochefoucauld, Abbé de la, i. 141
 Rodriguez, Alfonso, ii. 21
 Rohan, Cardinal, i. 139
Roma capitale, ii. 239 foll., 256 foll., 275, 280, 421
 Ronge, Johannes, ii. 78
 Roon, von, Prussian minister, ii. 444
 Roothaan, Jesuit General, ii. 49, 92, 145, 189
 Rosa, Martinez della, ii. 175, 178
 Rosmini-Serbatì, Antonio, ii. 72, 153 foll., 158 foll., 161 foll., 167 foll., 171 foll.
 Rossi, de', archæologist, ii. 352
 —, Pellegrino, ii. 90 foll., 96, 104 foll., 115, 125, 138 foll., 141, 143, 156 foll., 168
Rota Romana, i. 195
 Rothschild, ii. 65
 Rouher, French minister, ii. 285, 375, 381
 Rouland, ii., 337
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques, i. 52 foll.
 Royer, Bishop, i. 155, 162
 Rozaven, Jesuit, ii. 49, 69, 93
 Ruffo, Cardinal, i. 202, 205 foll., 307, 328, 332, 377; ii. 4, 5, 35
 Russia, i. 82, 171 foll., 345 foll., 348, 354, 355; ii. 10 foll., 272
 Russell, Lord John, ii. 184, 215, 247
 —, Odo, ii. 222, 249, 321, 329, 369, 416 note
SACCONI, confraternity of, ii. 20
 Sacy, de, i. 34
 — Silvestre, i. 276; ii. 215
 Saffi, ii. 174
 Saint Simon, i. 2, 16
 Sala, Cardinal, i. 358
 Salamon, de, i. 180 foll.
 Saldanha, Francisco de, Cardinal, appointed to visit the Portuguese Jesuits, i. 37 foll.
 Sambucca, Marchese de la, Neapolitan minister, i. 171
Sanfedisti, i. 363; ii. 24, 28, 41, 46, 65, 103, 123, 134 foll.
 Sanguinetti, ii. 298
 San Martino, Count Ponza di, ii. 384 foll., 388 foll.
 Santucci, ii. 116, 121, 224, 230 foll., 234
 Sardinia, island of, ii. 25
 Sarpi, Frà Paolo, ii. 54, 332
 Sartiges, Count de, ii. 253 foll.
 Saurine, Constitutional Bishop, i. 155, 162, 181
 Savigny, von, ii. 305
 Savines, Constitutional Bishop, i. 246
 Scherr, Archbishop, ii. 364, 368, 418, 435
 Schrader, Jesuit, ii. 192, 195, 262, 298, 357
 Schwarzenberg, Cardinal, ii. 298, 306, 310, 315, 320, 323, 325, 327, 332, 358 foll., 363, 367, 368, 418, 419

- Scialoia, ii. 279
 Sclopis, Count, ii. 218
 Sebastiani, ii. 59
 Ségur, de, ii. 185 foll., 293
 Sella, Italian minister, ii. 381, 382 foll., 384, 385, 403 foll.
 Senestrey, Bishop, ii. 293 foll., 325, 365, 418
 Sepp, ii. 305, 306
 September Convention, *see* Convention
 Sermoneta, Duke of, ii. 140, 399 foll.
 Severoli, Cardinal, ii. 3, 4, 41
 Sibour, Archbishop, ii., 191, 196, 197, 265
 Siccardi, ii. 200, 201, 287
 Siestrzencevicz, Stanislaus, Bishop, i. 172
 Silvagni, ii. 100
 Simeoni, Cardinal, ii. 458, 460, 461, 463, 464
 Simon, Jules, ii. 275, 460 foll.
 Simor, Archbishop, ii. 364, 368
Singulari vos, encyclical, ii. 71
 Soglia, Cardinal, ii. 156
Sollicitudo omnium, Bull, i. 346
 — *ecclesiarum*, ii. 64
 Somaglia, Cardinal della, i. 307, 355, 377; ii. 3, 8, 11, 18, 27, 28, 34, 39, 49
 Sonnenfels, Professor, i. 117
 Sorbonne, the, opposes Ultramontanism, i. 8; Jansenist sympathies of, 14, 17; compelled to accept the *Unigenitus*, 20; speaks on its behalf, 35; *esprit philosophique* at, 53
 Soubroux, Bernadette, ii. 197
 Spada, Giuseppe, ii. 109, 192, 298, 333
 Spangenberg, i. 109
 Spaur, Count, ii. 159, 164 foll.
 Spiegel, Archbishop, ii. 45
 Spina, Cardinal, i. 222, 229 foll., 307, 314
 Spinola, Cardinal, ii. 94
 — Marquis, ii. 404
 Staël, Madame de, i. 355
 Stahl, ii. 310, 434
 Stella, ii. 159, 172, 258
 Stellardi, ii. 217 foll.
 Sterbini, Pietro, ii. 127, 132, 160 foll.
 Stremayr, von, ii. 378
 Strossmayer, Bishop, ii. 322, 325, 327, 329, 332, 350 foll., 358 foll., 361, 363, 368, 418 foll., 420
 Sturbinetti, ii. 144, 162
Syllabus, the, of Pius IX., ii. 258 foll., 454
 TAIGI, ANNA MARIA, ii. 293
 Talbot, Mgr., ii. 222, 298
 Talleyrand, i. 141, 143, 146, 162, 232, 234, 235, 245, 255, 257, 264 foll. 272, 288, 351, 356
 Talleyrand, Madame de, i. 264
 Tamburini, i. 125
 Tanucci, Neapolitan minister, i. 48, 67, 97, 167, 168, 170 foll.
 Tata Giovanni, ii. 112
 Tchernichef, i. 171
 Teccio, Baron, ii. 225
 Tellier, le, i. 14, 15, 45
 Tencin, i. 31
 Testa, ii. 295
 Theiner, Augustin, i. 230 *note*, 280; ii. 155, 237, 262, 360
 Theophilanthropism, i. 161, 227, 245
 Theresa, St, i. 90, 108
 Thierry, Abbé, i. 301
 Thiers, i. 224; ii. 85, 86, 92, 129, 180, 273, 314, 405, 415, 424, 425, 427 foll.
 Thorvaldsen, i. 357, 371, 372, 377 foll.; ii. 81
 Thouvenel, ii. 216, 233, 234, 241, 242, 245 foll., 251
 Thugut, i. 192, 212
 Tizzani, ii. 326
 Tocqueville, Alexis de, ii. 177, 180, 442
 Tolentino, peace of, i. 184 foll., 200, 211
 Toloruci, ii. 236
 Tonello, ii. 277
 Tonnini, ii. 152, 192
 Torlonia, ii. 65, 100, 125, 220
 Torné, Anastase, Constitutional Bishop, i. 147
 Torregiani, i. 42, 57, 58, 59, 60
 Tosa, ii. 298
 Tournely, de, i. 343
 Toussaint, i. 28
 Tradition, theory of, ii. 191
 Trautmannsdorff, ii. 339 foll., 348
 ULLATHORNE, Bishop, ii. 325, 335, 454
 Umberto, Prince, ii. 412, 463
Unigenitus, the Bull, i. 14 foll., 35, 45
Univers, l', ii. 214 foll., 296, 310, 313, 334, 349, 356, 449
 Urquijo, d', Spanish minister, i. 202
 VALENCIANI, Bishop, ii. 371
 Valette, Père la, i. 43
 —, Marquis de la, ii. 245 foll.
 Valletta, Monaco la, ii. 298, 458
 Vannicelli, Cardinal, ii. 94, 177 foll.
 Vannutelli, Cardinal, ii. 464
 Vasquez, i. 5
 Vaughan, Bishop, ii. 454
 Vegezzi, ii. 272, 277
 Venaisin, *see* Avignon
 Ventura, Padre, ii. 133, 141 foll., 166, 207, 229
 Veuillot, Louis, ultramontane journalist,

- Veuillot (*continued*)—
 ii. 185, 214, 262, 264 foll., 267, 311,
 313, 317, 325, 335, 340, 349
- Vicini, ii. 61, 63
- Vico, Giambattista, i. 168
- Victor Emmanuel II., King of Italy,
 succeeds his father, ii. 174; speech at
 Turin, 200; losses, 201; announces
 his daughter Clotilde's marriage to
 Prince Napoleon, 206; goes to war
 with Austria, 207; proposal to make
 him vicegerent of Papal States, 209
 foll., 212 foll.; sends Stellardi to Pius
 IX., 217; "Italy for the Italians,"
 219 foll.; threatened by Napoleon,
 221; suppresses Garibaldi, 244;
 vacillates between Mazzini and the
 Pope, 249; breaks with Mazzini by
 September Convention, 254, 270; his
 views on question of capital, 255 foll.;
 obliged to escape from Turin, 270;
 has communications with Pius IX.,
 271 foll.; announces separation of
 State and Church, 272; alliance with
 Prussia, 273; refuses to forswear
 Rome, 276; correspondence with
 Pius, 277; excommunicated, 281; his
 anger at Rouher's *jamaïs*, 285; his
 illness, 287; anxious to help France,
 380; convinced of necessity of taking
 Rome, 385; breach with Lanza, 387;
 sends San Martino to Pius IX., 388;
 elected by plebiscite at Rome, 398
 foll.; his receipt of the news, 400;
 appropriates the Quirinal, 401; eager
 to go to Rome, 403; speech at
 Florence, 404; visits Rome after the
 flood, 404; sends respects to the
 Pope, 404, 425, 429; makes his entry
 into Rome as capital, 426; annoyed
 with Thiers, 428 foll.; confirms con-
 fiscation of church property, 433; re-
 ceived at Vienna and Berlin, 448;
 again annoyed with France, 450;
 picture of him and Pius together, 450;
 25th anniversary of his accession, 451;
 threatens the Vatican, 458; receives
 Gambetta, 461; illness and death,
 462 foll.
- Vigliani, ii. 455
- Vignali, i. 375
- Villafranca, Peace of, ii. 208
- Villemain, ii. 215
- Villestreux, de, ii. 424
- Vimercati, ii. 377
- Vineam Domini Sabaoth*, i. 13
- Visconti, Ennio, ii. 54
- Visconti-Venosta, Italian minister, ii. 271,
 278 foll., 347, 376, 380 foll., 385, 386,
 392, 400, 404, 422, 424
- Vitelleschi, Bishop, ii. 322
- Vitzthum, ii. 377
- Völney, i. 223
- Volta, i. 169
- Voltaire, i. 16, 25; dedicates *Mahomet*
 to the Pope, 27; flatters the Jesuits,
ibid.; on Portuguese action against
 them, 42; on their defeat in France,
 45; his *écraser l'infâme*, 52; on
 Church and State, 54; and the trial of
 Calas, 55
- Vrillière, La, i. 73
- WAGENER, ii. 440
- Walewski, ii. 216, 245, 248, 251 foll.
- Ward, William George, ii. 269
- Weishaupt, Adam, i. 135
- Weld, Cardinal, ii. 52
- Werner, Zacharias, i. 96
- Wessenberg, ii. 27
- Wicar, i. 258
- William I., King of the Netherlands, i.
 370
 — I., King of Prussia, ii. 402, 405,
 438, 444
- Windthorst, ii. 274, 305, 438, 445
- Wiseman, Cardinal, i. 104, 105, 207
note; ii. 1, 15, 183, 243
- Wuick, Jacob, his translation of the
 Bible, i. 366
- ZACCARIA, i. 83, 107, 114, 134, 174,
 194; ii. 41
- Zanardelli, ii. 457
- Zelada, i. 76
- Zelanti*, party of the, i. 59, 165, 179,
 186, 350, 362; ii. 3 foll., 33, 37
- Zola, Giuseppe, i. 125
- Zucchi, General, ii. 161, 167
- Zurla, Cardinal, ii. 11, 33, 55, 57

PRINTED AT THE EDINBURGH PRESS

9 AND 11 YOUNG STREET

BX Nielsen, Frederik Kristian, 1846-1907.
1386 The history of the papacy in the XIXth century
N5 by Dr. Frederik Nielsen ... Translated under
1906 the direction of Arthur James Mason ... London
J.Murray, 1906.
2 v. 23cm.

The first edition appeared under the title: Romer-kirken i
det 19.hundredaar. En historisk skildring. I. Paved~~smet~~.
København, Schønberg, 1876. The second edition, practically a
new work, appeared under the title: Paved~~smet~~ i det nittende
hundredaar. 2. udg. I-II. København, Schønberg, 1895-98. 2 v.

Contents.-I. Introduction, Pius VII.-II. Leo XII to Pius IX.

228227

